

UDC 94(477):316.32 «18»
DOI 10.35433/history.11194

Vengerska Victoria,
Doctor of Sciences (History),
Head of the Department of History of Ukraine,
Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University
e-mail: vengerska@ukr.net
Researcher ID: <http://www.researcherid.com/H-5464-2016>
ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8936-8893>

LANGUAGE AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES IN THE TERRITORIES OF THE WESTERN RUSSIAN EMPIRE GOVERNATES IN THE 19th CENTURY: SEARCHING FOR NATIONAL STANDARDS

Abstract

Languages played a crucial role in the nation-building processes of the 19th century. It is impossible to investigate these processes not taking into consideration the imperial phenomenon. The aim of this article is to analyze and compare peculiarities of language and educational practices that characterized the development of the Jewish and Polish communities in what is referred to as the «Western outskirts» of the Russian Empire. The elimination of the Polish educational institutions was accompanied by the elaboration of options for including the Polish youth into the common imperial context through the educational system, and through the system of higher education in the first place. However, the Polish language maintained the status of the language of record keeping, court proceedings, and daily communication until the November Uprising (1830-1831), which significantly complicated the task of the local Poles' assimilation.

The article hypothesizes that competitive surrounding that was created by the Hebrew and Yiddish supporters, who were aligned with the followers of the Russian language oriented assimilation project, fostered the crystallization and norm introduction of both Jewish languages, which was happening with simultaneous development of their literary standards. The project on the establishment of the Jewish teacher training institutions with elements of secular education, the Russian language and the Russian management proved to be inviable as it failed to conform to Jewish traditional religious education.

The methodology of the research: the article uses the comparative method to draw comparisons between language and educational practices of the representatives of the Polish and Jewish communities of the Southwestern and Northwestern territories during «the long 19th century», the elements of constructionist methodology enables the author to investigate the role of language marker in the implementation of the Polish and Jewish national projects. Instrumentarium of a so-called «new empire history» allows considering a destructive influence on national languages development in the nation-building process. The outlined methodology also testifies the presence of the novelty elements in the suggested material.

Starting from the middle of the 19th century the communicative dominance in the Russian empire was given to the Russian language. Other languages occupied their local niches, which largely limited their usage and functioning. The efforts of the authorities to reduce the communicative area of the national languages usage and to diminish their status had the perverse effect. The oppression only encouraged the creators of national «projects» to make every effort to standardize, expand the spheres of language usage, to actively use them as languages of literature and science. Questions related to the consolidation of the status of state languages in the newly created nation-states after the destruction of one empire and under new political circumstances in the context of another empire need further studies.

Key words: *nation-building process, language, empire, religious and secular education, Hebrew, Yiddish.*

Introduction. The beginning of the art nouveau period was marked by shifts in traditionalist ideas and cultural norms characteristic of earlier periods. The period of the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth with its nation of historic aristocratic nobility and the largest Jewish community in the Eastern Europe left an interesting heritage in the form of particular educational and language practices that responded to time challenges and new political circumstances.

Languages played one of the key roles in the nation-building process of the nineteenth century. It is impossible to investigate these processes not taking into consideration the imperial phenomenon. The author of the article in her previous publications elaborated on the rationale for this idea (Vengerska, 2016, pp. 126-139), analyzed the existing historiography on the outlined problem (first of all in the works of A. Kapeller (Kapeller, A., 2005), J. Chlebowczyk (Chlebowczyk, 1975), E. Nederhauser, (Nederhauser, 1981), E. Hobsbawm

(Hobsbawm, 2010), A. Miller (Miller, 2006), M. Moser (Moser, 2008), Ostapchuk O. (Ostapchuk, 2004) with a special emphasis on the role of the language factor in the Ukrainian nation-building process.

The main objective of the article is to analyze and compare the features of educational and language practices that characterized the development of the Jewish and Polish communities in the so-called «western outskirts» of the Russian Empire. The language factor is analyzed as one of the reasons for avoiding the complete assimilation of the Poles and Jews of the region that was related to the territories of modern Right-bank Ukraine, Lithuania and Belarus, which were parts of the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth before its second division. A large number of the Poles representing various social layers of the society automatically found themselves in the category of the empire subjects, together with a significant percentage of the Jewish population of the region.

Presenting the main material. By the November Uprising (1830-1831), the Polish language had dominated here as a language of record keeping, daily communication, and education. A characteristic feature of the Jewish communities of cities and towns of the region was a certain closeness of the communities (kahalas), and the preservation of traditional features in education and culture, in which a religious component occupied a prominent place. Yiddish remained the language of daily communication of Eastern European Jews, however Polish and Ukrainian (in the case of the Right-bank Ukraine), and eventually Russian were not considered to be foreign.

The novelty of the suggested material lies in the comparison of the language and educational situation in the Southwestern and Northwestern territories with a particular emphasis on two cities that played a radically different role both in history and in the processes of Ukrainian, Polish, Belorussian, Lithuanian and Jewish nation-building processes, namely Vilno (modern Vilnius) and Zhytomyr (a governorate center of Volyn). These cities (in the case of Zhytomyr quite unexpectedly) in some time turned into notable educational and intellectual Polish-oriented centers, as well as they were related to the implementation of an interesting educational project connected with an attempt of the Russian authorities to take control of the Jewish education.

The educational sphere of the above-mentioned region had its specific features, which were primarily connected with religious traditions. The Jesuit Order had been controlling the educational system in Catholic countries for a long time, and the territory of the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth was no exception. Its liquidation at the end of the eighteenth century gave an initiative in a control sphere to the state and other Catholic orders. In Ukrainian and Belarussian territories of the former Commonwealth, the successors of the Jesuit Order were the Basilian Order (associated with the Greek Catholic Church), the Order of Piarists and the Order of Discalced Carmelites. Of course, the empire in which the Orthodox religion was eligible for a dominant religion could not long tolerate this state of affairs. The Russian authorities started gradually introducing changes in the management and control systems of education.

In 1803 the Vilno Educational District was established, which included the educational institutions of the Vilno, Mogilev, Minsk, Volyn, Kyiv and Podilsk governorates (Lithuanian State Historical Archive. F. 567. Op. 2. Vol.1. D. 32. L. 2). For a long time well-known Polish public figures who tried to preserve the Polish specificity of the education in the region were involved in its administration for example A. Czartoryski and F. Czacki, who acted as a surveyor of educational institutions. They tried to preserve the Polish specifics of education, which was reflected in the contents of curriculum. However, the chain of historical events (ranging from the Russian and French War (1812) to the participation in foreign campaigns as the main conservative force opposed to French republicanism) led to changes in the environment and views of the Russian emperor. In 1818, Alexander I made the decision to withdraw the educational establishments of the Northwestern and Southwestern territories from the subordination of Vilno educational district and transfer them to Kharkiv district.

Despite political changes, elements of the Polish traditional education did not completely disappear from the curriculum. The approved list of textbooks included religious texts, such as a short catechesis for Roman Catholics, as well as a collection of prayers, which were written in Polish but were for the «reigning monarch». It was entirely in line with the desire of the authorities to turn the Poles into loyal subjects of the empire. The authorities gradually but

persistently introduced the Russian language as a compulsory discipline. In high school, History of the Russian Empire was also added as an element of patriotic upbringing (the textbooks «Life Description of the Russian Empire» by V. Ziablovskyi and «A Short Course in the Russian Empire» were used) (Lithuanian State Historical Archive. F. 567. Op 2. D. 32. LL.22–24).

After the suppression of the February Uprising (1830-1831), the «thawing» period between the Russian authorities and the Poles ended. One of the first institutions to experience «the chill» in the relationship were the well-known overtly Polish- orientated educational institutions, faculty and students. It concerns Vilno University and Kremenetskyi Lyceum, although small local schools, lyceums, gymnasiums, in which the content and approach to education did not correspond to the new imperial regulations, were not ignored by the authorities. The majority of these institutions were either shut down or restructured after the revision made by a special committee, which consisted of Kharkiv University lecturers (Lithuanian State Historical Archive. F. 439, Op 1. D. 218. L. 26).

The authorities were aware of the impossibility of complete removal of the Polish language from the educational process, as well as of its instantaneous replacement by Russian in the judicial, administrative spheres and partly in everyday life of the western outskirts of the empire. However, some steps in this direction were made starting from the 1830s. For instance, a ministry officials' proposal to make changes to the content of higher and secondary education, as well as of primary education was considered to be a possible option. There appeared a project to publish Polish children's books in Cyrillic letters, which were meant to be distributed among rural children (Miller (ed.), 2006, p. 225).

The main idea of education reformers was to create such institutions that would fulfill the mission of «educating youth in the spirit of loyalty to the Russian throne» (Koyalovich, 1865, p. 21). The key changes in the education content concerned the expansion of the Russian language teaching program. Since then, only “Russian people” were entitled to manage educational institutions (Rudnitskaya, 2017, pp.52–53).

The elimination of the Polish educational institutions was accompanied by the development of options for including the Polish youth into the imperial context through the system of education, and

what is more important through the system of higher education. Education was (and still is) a traditional tool for loyal patriotic attitude formation. The structure of the Russian society equalized the rights of nobility representatives, a significant percentage of which were the Poles. The right to higher education prior to the beginning of the reforms of the 1860–1870s exclusively belonged to nobility privileges. As the Poles prevailed among the nobility of the Right-bank Ukraine (or according to the imperial version of the Southwestern territory (krai)), the foundation of Kyiv University (St. Volodymyr's Imperial University) encouraged the Polish youth to enter. However, the main idea and task of the newly founded university was to proclaim the merge of “winners with the defeated” (Dolbilov, 1999, p. 43). The author of the slogan “Autocracy, Orthodoxy, People”, as well as of the basic imperial doctrine of the second half of the nineteenth century was S. Uvarov, the Minister of Education.

As M. Dolbilov noted in his research, the imperial power sought to involve noble youth in Russian life through legislative acts and financial incentives (Dolbilov, 1999, p. 43). In order to achieve this, scholarships for the young people from the Kingdom of Poland were established in the 1840s at universities of two capitals (Moscow and St. Petersburg). Nicholas I constantly demanded to keep him informed about the behavior of the Poles graduating from Russian universities (Dolbilov, 1999, p. 39). At the Emperor's personal direction, the possibility of teaching in the Polish language and its usage in the educational institutions of the Southwestern and Northwestern territories was limited. The curriculum of gymnasiums located in this region included the Church Slavonic language (Miller, Dolbilov (ed.), p. 103).

During this period, namely in the 1840s, Nicholas I decides on the need to establish control over the Jewish education, which had a traditional religious character. The main task for officials was to turn Jewish education into the secular line, although some traditional elements were preserved (Dolbilov, 2010, p. 123). Rabbinical professional schools were opened in Vilno and Zhytomyr, the main purpose of which was to prepare educated rabbis and teachers for the Jewish educational institutions.

The beginning of the new emperor's reign (Alexander's II) was marked by the announcement of amnesty, which also concerned the

former participants of the February Uprising (1830-1831). A sign of reconciliation with the Poles was the renewal of the study of Polish (as one of the foreign languages) in Kyiv Educational District in 1860 (Miller, Dolbilov (ed.), p. 142).

After the January Uprising (1863) the situation changed dramatically. In 1864, the Ministry of People's Education introduced percentage ratings that regulated the number of the Polish students in universities. For St. Volodymyr's University it was 20%, for others – 10% (Dolbilov, 1999, p. 50) For the Jews, the percentage ratings were introduced much later, in 1886. They should not have exceeded 10% within the settlement boundary, in other parts of the empire – 5%, in Moscow and St. Petersburg – 3%. (Shulgin, 2007).

From the mid-1860s several concepts of counteracting the rebellious «Polish features» and their threats (both real and hypothetical) emerged. Proponents of the first one were convinced of the harmfulness of the prohibition acts, which, in their view, only contributed to the strengthening of protest and the spread of revolutionary, anti-imperial ideas. Supporters of the second concept were convinced of the need for maximum isolation of the Poles, in particular the Polish youth, who had an aspiration to get higher education at universities in the Western territory (krai) (Miller, Dolbilov (ed.), PP. 142–143). From time to time the advocates of this concept called for «toughening» the procedure for admission of the Poles to all Russian universities. Despite the presence of such attitudes, after 1869 the authorities softened their policy towards the Polish as well as the Ukrainian language (in the interval between the adoption of the Valuiev Circular in 1863 and the Yemsky decree of 1876) (Miller, Dolbilov (ed.), p. 227). Such «waves» of weakening/strengthening of restrictive measures coincided with the next political crises and the attempts to overcome them.

The tension between the supporters of different options for resolving the «Polish question» had not subsided until the proclamation of independence of Poland on November 11, 1918. However, for most Poles, the language as a marker of their national identity (in conjunction with Catholic denomination) remained the key element.

As a result of the second division of the Commonwealth the Russian empire inherited the Right-Bank Ukraine and a significant number of

Jewish population. The majority of cities within settlement boundary set by Catherine II belonged to the category of shtetls (townships). The traditional life of the Jewish community had its own peculiarities, and differed from the lives of its immediate neighbors. Laws and rules were based on the traditions and the power of local authorities, and generally were connected with religion. Ritual and educational practices were associated with Judaism. In this religious system, Hebrew occupied a special place as for a long time it was considered exclusively a language of literary wisdom. It did not belong to the colloquial style; rather it had the status of the language for the initiates.

The Jewish Enlightenment Haskalah and its representatives the Maskilim greatly influenced the change of this status and made every effort to overcome the isolation and penetration of the modernizing elements into the Jewish society. This included adapting Hebrew to everyday conversational practices. The majority of the Maskilim preferred Hebrew and wrote mostly in this language. The language was considered to be the unification factor of the Jewish people in the future.

From the moment of inclusion of Right-bank Ukraine, as well as other Western territories in the Russian Empire, there appeared the circulars and regulations, the content of which indicated the authorities' desire to limit the scope of use of the Jewish people's languages that is Hebrew and Yiddish (the spoken language of Eastern European Jews). As N. Rudnitskaya points out (Rudnitskaya, 2017, p. 50) that the Provisions of 1804 allowed the usage of the Hebrew language only in religious ceremonies and in everyday life. Record keeping, trade agreements etc., should have been made exclusively in Russian.

As the Polish language remained the main language of record keeping and court proceedings for a long time, namely, from the moment of inclusion of these territories to the Russian Empire in 1793 until the suppression of the February Uprising (1830-1831), its knowledge was a prerequisite for the Jews, who applied for or held the public office or worked in kahals or a rabbinate. In addition to the Polish language, since 1808 the acquisition of German and Russian for the Jews was also obligatory (Rudnitskaya, N., 2017, p. 50).

The presence of two languages made it difficult to choose the «main» (national) language for the Jews living in the Russian Empire. In

the context of the implementation of the so-called «assimilator» project, Russian was considered as such.

Hebrew gradually evolved from a language of extremely narrow religious usage to the literary language, the development of which became an integral part of the nation-building process in the 19th – early 20th century. At the same time the Yiddish literature was developing. This linguistic situation demonstrated the uniqueness of the Jewish national project.

The Russian authorities established relations with the representatives of the Jewish communities of the empire in different ways. The undulating weakening and strengthening of the restrictive legislation against the Jews compelled the representatives of the various social strata of Judaism to adjust to these fluctuations. One of the most liberal reigns towards the Jews is the reign of Alexander II. In 1859, the settlement boundary for the wealthy Jews, including the merchants of the first Guild was virtually abolished. The inconsolable for the empire results of the Crimean war, the need for additional financial injections to implement the reforms, which were under development, and the traditional «staff hunger» are among the main reasons for the change in attitude towards this category of Jews.

During the 1860s liberalization against representatives of other categories of Judaism continued – from skilled artisans to educated people, pharmacists, and other professional groups that could be of particular benefit to the reformed society. In 1861, the Jews were granted the right to apply for public office. One of the main tasks set by the Russian bureaucrats was to approximate as much as possible the «useful» categories of the Jewish society to the established standards of «insiders». The adoption of Christianity and fluency in Russian became a prerequisite for such approximation. A. Miller described the relations between the Jews and the Russian empire during this period as «a period of liberal invitation to assimilation» (Miller, 2006).

As it was mentioned above, the Russian society preserved a class structure throughout the «long nineteenth century». The fact of belonging to the higher social strata became another «pass» for crossing/overcoming the settlement boundary. Unlike the Poles, the percentage of nobles among Jews was scanty. There are only a few families known, whose representatives received the noble title for the

special services to the empire – the Poliakovs, the Jozefovichs, the Garkavs, the Hindsburgs, the Efrons and several others (Manoilenko, 2017).

However, like a large number of the poor Yiddish-speaking townspeople, the wealthy and well-educated Jews remained strangers to the empire; «outsiders» A. Miller suggests using the term «allosemitism», introduced into the scientific circulation by the English sociologist of the Polish descent Sigmund Bauman (Miller, 2006). Maintaining the settlement boundary prior to the February Revolution of 1917 confirms the specificity of the relationship between the empire and the Jews.

The era of reforms of the second half of the 19th century stimulated the economic development, expansion and complication of communication systems. In these circumstances, the press occupied a special place. Periodicals became an integral part of the propaganda and dissemination of national ideas in their modern version. According to Y. Petrovsky-Shtern, it was in the middle of the 19th century when the Jewish secular literary culture was born, namely journalism and fiction, which expressed itself in all Eastern European languages, as well as Hebrew and Yiddish (Petrovsky-Shtern, 2016, p. 181).

The press was also used as a speaking trumpet to spread the Russian language in the Jewish environment. This process was also supported by the authorities and censorship institutions. The first periodical in Russian edited by Jewish publicists, the magazine «Rassvet» (the Dawn) (a weekly publication) appeared in 1860. It was published in St. Petersburg by A. Rabinovich. Despite the usage of the Russian language, the authors of the publication demonstrated a favorable attitude towards the Jewish national religious values, Hebrew and the idea of Eretz-Israel settling. After the riotous disturbances of the early 1880s, the editorial board decided that the only solution to the Jewish issue was emigration. Since then «The Rassvet» became one of the main promoters of organized emigration and the so-called Palestinian movement (Rassvet, <https://eleven.co.il/jewish-literature/in-russian/13447/>). In the late 1870s the magazine «The Russian Jew» appeared, and since the early 1880s another Jewish magazine «Voskhod» (the Rise) (<https://eleven.co.il/jewish-literature/in-russian/10977/>) was published.

As a part of the approximation/domestication/assimilation strategies, the idea of establishing control over the Jewish traditional education emerged. The first «approach» by the authorities to this area was carried out in the second half of the 1840s. It was decided to establish educational establishments where the Jewish youth would have been trained to work in Russian-language Jewish schools.

The Jewish teaching training institutes (with teaching in the Russian language) were opened only in two cities of the so-called western outskirts of the empire – Zhytomyr and Vilno. They were opened based on rabbinical professional schools, which operated there from 1847 to 1873. In 1873, a reform of state Jewish professional schools took place. The establishment of teacher training institutes based on rabbinical professional schools resulted in the elimination of future rabbis' preparation. Open institutions resisted the universities in the issues of their influence level and concentration of intellectual powers.

According to the government decision, only Christians could be directors and teachers of institutes (except for positions of surveyors, teachers of Jewish subjects and Mathematics) (Rudnytska, 2017, PP. 135–136). The graduates of these educational institutions were entitled to teach exclusively in the Jewish educational establishments.

Zhytomyr, the Volyn governorate center, became a powerful center of Jewish cultural and educational life in the Right-bank Ukraine due to activity of the Jewish teacher training institute. It is with the representatives of this region that the development of literature, the corresponding formation of literary standards, and the acquisition of Hebrew as a language of daily communication are associated. In particular, one of the first poetic collections of the Russian Haskala was the poem «Four Seasons», written by Jacob Eichenbaum. He worked as a surveyor and taught at the rabbinical professional school in Zhytomyr in 1850-1861. The formation of the literary standard of the Hebrew language was associated with the attention of its creators to sciences and activities that stimulated mental development, in particular, to chess games. J. Eichenbaum's works gained popularity after his work «The Battle» (Gakrab) which was published in London in 1840, in which the author in a poetic form outlined the chess rules in the form of battles of two armies. The poem was translated into Russian, and republished

many times. It was an important step in the development of the Hebrew poetry (Eichenbaum, 2011).

After J. Eichenbaum's death in 1862, a famous mathematician and teacher Kh. Slonimskyi was appointed a new surveyor of Zhytomyr rabbinical professional school. Before his appointment in 1861 in Warsaw, he started a new newspaper (in Hebrew) called «the Ha-Zfira» («the Time»). From the moment of its appearance, its main task was to promote knowledge of nature studies and mathematics. The support of these sciences remained an integral part of the publication, which was published with little interruptions for more than 40 years.

Zhytomyr Jewish institute began its work in 1873 and in 12 years, it became a center of gravity for prominent representatives of Jewish culture and education. One of the creators of the new Hebrew language norms, Mendele Mokher Sforim (real name – Scholem-Jankew Broide), taught at the Rabbinic professional school from 1869, and from 1873 to 1881 at the teacher training institute. In 1869, he lived in Berdichev and published the drama «Di Takse», the work which criticized Berdychiv authorities and made him move to Zhytomyr. Zhytomyr period of his work also accounts for the appearance of the novel «Fishke der Krumer», which was eventually reworked into a novel and play that was popular with Jewish theaters (Ryvkina, without date of publication).

Odessa period of life (early 1890s) is associated with the author's work aimed at language formation. At this time, he actively wrote and published works in Hebrew, translated into Hebrew his own works written previously in Yiddish (Ryvkina, without date of publication).

In 1873, the Vilno Jewish institute opened its doors to students and teachers. Unlike Zhytomyr, this educational institution was operating much longer. For example, one of the 2017 Belarussian studies cites an article from «The Belarussian Way» (Belaruski Shliakh) dated August 17, 1918, which stated that «Jews called Vilno «the Lithuanian Jerusalem» not in vain because the best Jewish books were published here, the Jewish teacher training institute was operating until the last days» (Dmitrieva, 2017, 118).

The general situation, changes in domestic policy related to the economic problems that resulted from the Russo-Turkish War (1877-1878), as well as the assassination of Alexander II in 1881, led to the spread of anti-Semitic sentiment. Its intensification became a common

European trend, aggravated by one political crisis and another. As noted by A. Miller, this period was characterized as the ultimate collapse of enlightenment optimism in the Jewish intellectual community (Miller, 2006).

The emergence of anti-Jewish legislation in the 1880s encouraged admiration with «left» political ideologies. The idea of social justice, of equality treated in a specific way, the denial of private property priority in the environment of well-educated youth, who in time became actively involved in social-democratic and communist parties, gradually gained popularity.

The first political party to emerge on the territory of the Russian Empire was the socialist «The Bund» – the General Jewish Workers' Union of Lithuania, Poland and Russia, which was established in 1897 in Vilno. Since the inception of the Social Revolutionary Party (SRs), a significant percentage of the Jewish youth remained in its ranks. Other Jewish organizations that emerged between the time of the Russian Revolution of 1905-1907 and World War I were the Zionists, the Paoli-Zion (Marxist Zionists) and others. Public and political figures were not unanimous in resolving the Jewish issue. There was an option of creating cultural and national autonomy; another alternative was to build an independent Jewish state. Thus, the main slogan of the Bund was proclaimed – «Our country is where we live». The party ideologues were convinced that the Jews should preserve their culture, way of life and the Yiddish language development, its widespread usage in state institutions, local authorities (Program documents of Russian parties, <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/natsionalnaya-programma-bunda-korrektivny-1917-goda/viewer>).

Typically composed, containing program provisions the liberal Folkspartei (Jewish People's Party) had powerful social rhetoric with elements of socialist ideas. Its leaders, most notably S. Dubnov, offered their own variant of solving the Jewish question based on cultural and personal autonomy. In the party program document, the language was granted the status of a «body», and Yiddish was meant to become this very body. It was emphasized that a significant minority who used a different language (Hebrew) in everyday life had the right to communicate that language with the authorities and in various institutions. The section devoted to school affairs testified to differences

in party representatives' views on the nature and content of education from the traditional ones. It emphasized that the Jewish educational institutions should be secular (Election Platform «Yiddish Folkspartei», 1917).

Religion was suggested to be taught only to those who had the desire to study it. The language of instruction in the Jewish school had to be the mother tongue of the students, which for the vast majority of Jewish children was Yiddish. In a note to this paragraph, the party emphasized that the choice of language remained the right of the parents, but the «Jewish spirit and purposes» should remain central to the educational process (Election Platform «Yiddish Folkspartei», 1917).

Unlike the Bundes and members of the Folkspartei, the Zionists viewed the democratic society in Russia not as a goal in and of itself, but as a wonderful base for a future Aliyah, as a favorable climate for the education of free citizens of the future Jewish state. An essential part of the Zionism ideology was the idea of the Hebrew revival, the desire to break up with the heritage of the diaspora and with the languages spoken by Jews who lived under foreign domination. These ideas were based on the views and activities of public and cultural figures of previous periods. In addition to the above-mentioned writers, who contributed to the «democratization» of Hebrew, it is impossible to ignore the figure of Ben-Yehuda, who started publishing the newspaper «Ha-Zvi» in the Hebrew language aimed at adult learning in 1884, in Palestine. He is considered the «father» of Modern Hebrew and the promoter of its active usage as a means of daily communication (Ben-Yehuda Eliezer). Hobsbawm emphasized «...national languages... are almost always semi-artificial entities, and at times, like Modern Hebrew, they are «invented» (Hobsbawm, 2010, p. 74).

The solution to the so-called territorial problem, along with the linguistic issue, which was to a lesser extent religious, became the cornerstones of confrontation both in the midst of Jewish social political movements and in relations between the Russian authorities and the representatives of the Jewish structures. During the nineteenth century, thanks to the efforts of representatives of the Jewish educational circles in different countries, the idea of giving the status of the state language to Hebrew was widely supported. This project was implemented as early

as the twentieth century, when alongside with the creation of the State of Israel the language gained official status.

Starting from the middle of the 19th century the Russian language gradually consolidated the communicative dominance in the Russian Empire. Other languages enjoyed their own, local niches, which largely restricted their usage and functioning. This situation became one of the reasons for the intensification of activities for granting national languages a higher status, which would allow them to be used in the educational process, the judiciary and cultural spheres, as well as in publishing industry. Since most of them were not normalized, the so-called «phonetic wars» were held amongst intellectual thinkers of the time. These wars became an inseparable part of the nationalization process, during which the literary standards of the languages, which are still being used in most nation-states, were eventually formed.

Conclusions. For contemporary Israel and Poland (unlike for Ukraine) the language issue is not so acute. In the Israeli constitution the Hebrew language is assigned the role of the state language (though Arabic has a special status) (the Fundamental Law – Israel is a nation-state of the Jewish people), but the possibility of preserving and using Yiddish (for the natives of the East European countries) and Ladino (or Sephardic) for Jews from Africa, Spain and the Iberian Peninsula in a daily communication also exists. The language issue for Poland, being one of the Europe's most mono-ethnic states, is currently not on the agenda. Despite the efforts of the imperial/soviet authorities to impose Russian as an official language and the language of everyday communication, in the Polish case these attempts proved vain. However, some of the Poles, like the Jews, assimilated and became speakers of the Russian language, maintaining (in the majority cases) their national identity. The modernization processes had a negative impact on the lives of the Jewish Shtetls, undermining both the very fact of their existence and the preservation of Yiddish as the language of these towns.

However, it can be argued that the efforts of the authorities to reduce the communicative usage of national languages and to diminish their status had the perverse effect. The oppression only encouraged the creators of national «projects» to make every effort to standardize, expand their usage spheres, and actively use them as languages of literature and science. Questions related to the consolidation of the

status of state languages in the newly created nation-states after the destruction of one empire and in new political circumstances in the context of another empire need further investigation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Budnitskiy, O., Miller, A., Dolbilov M. (scientific editor), **Berezhna, L.** (2006). The Western Outskirts of the Russian Empire. M.: NLO. 607. [In Russian].

Ben-Iyekhuda Eli'zer. <https://eleven.co.il/jewish-languages/hebrew/10508/>. [In Russian].

Chlebowczyk, J. (1975) Nation-forming Processes in Eastern Central Europe in the Era of Capitalism (from the late 18th to the Early 20th Century). Warsaw – Krakow, 37. [In Polish].

Hobsbawm, E. (2010). Nations and Nationalism, Starting from 1780: Program, Myths, Reality. K.: Ukrainian Center for Spiritual Culture, 288. [In Russian].

Dmitrieva, O. (2017). National Communities in the Belarus Territory during the World War I (1914-1918). Minsk, 118. [In Russian].

Dolbilov, M., (2010). Russian Land, Alien Faith: Ethno-Confessional Policy of the Empire in Lithuania and Belarus under Alexander II. M.: NLO, 1000. [In Russian].

Dubnov, S. (1998). The book of Life: Memories and Reflections: Materials for the History of My Time. St. Petersburg: Petersburg Oriental Studies, 672. [In Russian].

Dubnov, S. (1907). Letters on Old and New Jewry (1897-1907). St. Petersburg: Public benefit, 370. [In Russian].

The Election Newspaper of the Poltava Governorate Committee of the Yiddish Folkspartei Party (1917). November 9, № 3. [In Russian].

Eichenbaum, Y. (2011). Gakrab (Battle). A Poem about a Chess Game. Translation from Hebrew by O. Rabinovich. Salamandra, 97. [In Russian].

The Election Platform “Yiddish Folkspartei” (1917). <http://www.rummuseum.info/node/5641>.

Kappeler, A. (2005). Russia as a Multi-ethnic Empire: Emergence. History. Lviv, UCU Publishing House, 360. [In Ukrainian].

Kappeler, A. (2007). Center and Peripheral Elites in the Habsburg,

Russian and Ottoman Empires (1700-1918). *Ab Imperio*, 2, 17-57. [In Russian].

Kappeler, A. (2010). Russia as a Multinational Empire: Some Thoughts Eight Years after the Publication of the book. Myths and Fallacies in the Study of Empires and Nationalism. Drafting editors: I. Gerasimov, M. Mogilner, A. Semenov. M.: New publishing house, 265-281. [In Russian].

Kasyanov, H. (1993). Ukrainian Intellectuals at the Turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. *Socio-political Portrait*. K.: Lybid, 178. [In Ukrainian].

Koyalovich, M (1865). Documents Explaining the History of the West Russian region and Its Relation to Russia and Poland. – St. Petersburg at the printing house of Eduard Prad, 123. [In Russian].

Liven, D. (2005). Empire, History and the Modern World Order. *Ab Imperio*, 1, 75-116. [In Russian].

Lysyak-Rudnitsky, I. (1994). Historical essays. T.1. K: Osnova, 554. [In Ukrainian].

Lithuanian State Historical Archives. (1775-1889). F.567. Op. 2. T.1. D. 32.

Lithuanian State Historical Archives. (1792-1832). F.439. Op. 1. D. 218.

Lithuanian State Historical Archives. (1792-1832). F.721. Op.2. T.1. D. 52.

Magochiy P-R., Petrovsky-Shtern, Y (2016). Jews and Ukrainians. Millennium coexistence. Uzhhorod, publishing house Valery Padyak. 1003. [In Ukrainian].

Manoilenko A., Manoilenko Y. (2017). A Brief Biographical Dictionary of Persons of Jewish Confession - Nobles of the Russian Empire (1871-1917). Reference publication. St. Petersburg, Petersburg Institute of Jewish Studies; Russian State Historical Archive, 100. [In Russian].

Miller, A. (2006). The Romanov's Empire and the Jews. Public on polit.ua. <http://www.polit.ru/article/2006/06/06/miller3/>. [In Russian].

Miller, A., Ostapchuk, O. (2006). Latin and Cyrillic in the Ukrainian National Discourse and Language Policy of the Russian and Habsburg Empires. *Slavic studies*, 5, 25-48. [In Russian].

Mozer, M. (2008). To the History of the Ukrainian Language. Kharkov Historical and Philological Society. XVI, 832. [In Russian].

Niederhauser, E (1981). The Role of National Culture in the Formation of a Nation. The Formation of Nations in Central and Southeast Europe. Historical and historical-cultural aspects. M.: Nauka, 247-250. [In Russian].

Ostapchuk, O. (2004). Change in State Borders as a Factor in the Formation of the Language Situation in Right-Bank Ukraine at the Turn of the 18th-19th Centuries. Regions and borders of Ukraine in historical perspective. Yearbook. M.: Nauka, 2005, 227-253. [In Russian].

The Fundamental Law – Israel is a nation-state of the Jewish people. <http://knesset.gov.il/laws/ru/yesodru16.pdf>. [In Russian].

Petrovsky-Shtern, Y. (2009) Moshko the Imperial. *Ab Imperio*. 1, 115-146. [In Russian].

Program Documents of Russian Parties.
<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/natsionalnaya-programma-bunda-korrektivny-1917-goda/viewer>.

Rudnitskaya, N. (2017). History of the Jews of Zhytomyr Region. Zhytomyr: FOB O. Yevenok. 370. [In Ukrainian].

Sorokin, R. (1873). M. N. Muraviov in Lithuania. 1831. *Russkaia starina* (Russian antiquity), T.8, 7, 114-118. [In Russian].

Tereshkovich, P. (2009). Borderland as a Fate: Metamorphoses of Identity in the East European borderland. *Ab Imperio*, 1, 191-226. [In Russian].

Ryvkina, H. Mendele-Moyer Sforim, "Grandfather" of Contemporary Jewish Literature. Publications in the funds of the Judaica Department. <http://www.nbu.gov.ua/node/3556>. [In Ukrainian].

Shporlyuk, R. (2000). Empire and Nations. From the Historical Experience of Ukraine, Russia, Poland and Belarus. K.: Dukh i litera, 354. [In Ukrainian].

Shulgin, V. (2007). What do We Dislike about Them? About Anti-Semitism in Russia.

<https://web.archive.org/web/20120102224934/http://lindex.lenin.ru/Lindex3/Text/shulgin/index.htm>. [In Russian].

Folksparty. Electronic Jewish Encyclopedia. <http://www.eleven.co.il/article/14314>. [In Russian].

«Rassvet». <https://eleven.co.il/jewish-literature/in-russian/13447/>. [In Russian].

Vengerska, V. (2013). The Jewish Political Parties and the Jews in the political Parties: Social, Strata, Public, and National Dilemmas. World Wars of the twentieth century and historical memory: Collection of scientific works. Dnipropetrovsk. Tkuma Institute, 25-34. [In Ukrainian].

Vengerska, V. (2016). Ukrainian Nation and Nationalism in the 20-21st Centuries: Historiographic Aspects. History and historiography in Europe, 5, 126-139. [In Ukrainian].

«Voskhod» (the Rise) (<https://eleven.co.il/jewish-literature/in-russian/10977/>) [In Russian].

Венгерська Вікторія. МОВНІ ТА ОСВІТНІ ПРАКТИКИ НА ТЕРИТОРІЯХ ЗАХІДНИХ ГУБЕРНІЙ РОСІЙСЬКОЇ ІМПЕРІЇ В XIX СТ.: У ПОШУКУ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИХ СТАНДАРТІВ

Анотація

Мовам належала одна із ключових ролей в націотворчих процесах XIX ст. Дослідження цих процесів в окреслений період неможливо поза межами імперського. Головним завданням запропонованої статті є аналіз та порівняння особливостей освіти та мовних практик, які характеризували розвиток єврейських та польських громад на так званих «західних окраїнах» Російської імперії. Ліквідація польських за характером навчальних закладів супроводжувалась розробкою варіантів включення польської молоді до загальноімперського контексту через систему освіти, й перш за все, вищу. Однак, збереження за польською статусу мови діловодства, судочинства, щоденного спілкування до Листопадового повстання 1830-1831 рр. значно ускладнило завдання асиміляції місцевих поляків.

Висловлюється припущення, що конкуруюче середовище, що було створене прихильниками використання ївриту та їдишу, до яких долучались симпатичні асимілітаційного проекту з орієнтацією на російську мову, сприяло кристалізації та унормуванню кожної єврейської мови із одночасним розвитком їх літературних стандартів. Проект зі створення єврейських вчительських інститутів з елементами світської освіти, російською мовою та російським керівництвом виявився нежиттєздатним через неможливість досягти їх узгодження з єврейською традиційно-релігійною освітою.

Методологія: у статті використано компаративний метод для порівняння мовних та освітніх практик представників польських та єврейських громад Південно-Західного та Північно-Західного краю протягом «довгого XIX ст.», елементи конструктивістської методології дозволили дослідити роль мовного маркера в реалізації польського та єврейського національних проєктів. Інструментарій так званої «нової імперської історії» дозволив розглянути не лише деструктивний вплив на розвиток національних мов в націотворенні. Окреслена методологія засвідчує й наявність елемента новизни в запропонованому матеріалі.

В Російській імперії від середини XIX ст. комунікативне домінування поступово закріплюється за російською мовою. Іншим мовам відводилися свої, локальні ніші, які значною мірою обмежували їх вживання та використання. намагання влади скоротити комунікативний простір використання національних мов та принизити їх статус мали цілком зворотній ефект. Їх утиски лише стимулювали творців національних «проєктів» докладати максимум зусиль для унормування, розширення сфер вжитку, активного використання в якості мов літератури та науки. Подальших досліджень потребують питання, пов'язані із закріпленням статусів державних мов у новостворених національних державах після руйнації однієї імперії та нових політичних обставин в умовах іншої.

Ключові слова: націотворення, мова, імперія, релігійна та світська освіта, іврит, їдиш.

***Wiktoria Węgierska. JĘZYKOWE I EDUKACYJNE PRAKTYKI NA
TERYTORIUM ZACHODNICH GUBERNII IMPERIUM
ROSYJSKIEGO W XIX WIEKU: W POSZUKIWANIU
NARODOWYCH STANDARDÓW***

Streszczenie

Językam należała jedna z kluczowych ról w procesie budowania społeczeństwa w XIX wieku. Niemożliwe jest badanie tych procesów poza okresem imperialnym. Głównym celem proponowanego artykułu jest analiza i porównanie cech edukacji i praktyk językowych, które charakteryzowały rozwój społeczności żydowskiej i polskiej na tzw. “zachodnich peryferiach” Imperium Rosyjskiego. Likwidacji polskich instytucji edukacyjnych towarzyszył rozwój wariantów włączenia polskiej młodzieży w kontekst imperialny poprzez system edukacji, a przede wszystkim, szkoły wyższe. Jednak, utrzymanie języka polskiego jako języka dokumentów, sądownictwa, codziennej komunikacji aż do powstania listopadowego w latach 1830-1831 znacznie skomplikowało zadanie asymilacji lokalnych Polaków.

Przypuszcza się, że środowisko konkurencyjne stworzone przez zwolenników używania języka hebrajskiego i jidysz, w które dołączyli się sympatyzatorzy projektu asymilacyjnego (na język rosyjski), sprzyjało kryształizacji i unormowaniu każdego języka żydowskiego, jednocześnie rozwijając ich standardy literackie. Projekt stworzenia żydowskich instytucji nauczycielskich z elementami świeckiej edukacji, w języku rosyjskim i pod rosyjskim kierownictwem okazał się nierealnym z powodu niemożliwości osiągnięcia zgody z tradycyjną żydowską edukacją religijną.

Metodologia: W artykule wykorzystano metodę porównawczą dla porównania praktyk językowych i edukacyjnych przedstawicieli społeczności polskiej i żydowskiej z terytoriów południowo-zachodnich i północno-zachodnich regionów w "długim XIX wieku". Elementy metodologii konstruktywistycznej pozwoliły zbadać rolę znacznika języka w realizacji polskiego i żydowskiego projektów narodowych. Zestaw narzędzi tak zwanej "nowej historii imperium" umożliwił rozważenie nie tylko destrukcyjnego wpływu na rozwój języków narodowych w tworzeniu narodu. Przedstawiona metodologia potwierdza również obecność elementu nowości w proponowanym materiale.

W Imperium Rosyjskim od połowy XIX wieku dominacja komunikacyjna stopniowo przechodzi do języka rosyjskiego. Inne języki zostały przeniesione do ich własnych nisz, co w dużej mierze ograniczyło ich użycie i wykorzystanie. Próby władz ograniczyć przestrzeń komunikacyjną w zakresie używania języków narodowych i zmniejszenia ich statusu przyniosły odwrotny skutek. Ich ucisk tylko zachęcił twórców narodowych "projektów" do podjęcia wszelkich wysiłków w celu standaryzacji, rozszerzenia dziedzin ich zastosowania, aktywnego wykorzystywania ich jako języków literatury i nauki. Dalsze badania wymagają pytań związanych z wzmocnieniem statusu języków państwowych w nowo utworzonych państwach narodowych po zniszczeniu całego imperium i nowych warunków politycznych w kontekście tych państw.

***Słowa kluczowe:** tworzenie narodu, język, imperium, edukacja religijna i świecka, język hebrajski, jidysz.*

The article was received 08.28.2019
Article recommended for publishing 09.26.2019