Under a Double Headed Eagle: Józef Mianowski

# Central and Eastern Europe

*Regional Perspectives in Global Context*

*Series Editors*



VOLUME 13

# Under a Double Headed Eagle: Józef Mianowski

*Biography of a Conservative*

*by*

Leszek Zasztowt

*Translated from Polish by*

Konrad Brodziński

BRILL | SCHÖNINGH

The Author: Leszek Zasztowt is a historian, ordinary professor and a former director of the Ludwik & Aleksander Birkenmajer Institute for the History of Science (2007–2015), Polish Academy of Sciences, and professor at the University of Warsaw at the Center for East European Studies. President of the Józef Mianowski Fund – A Foundation for the Promotion of Science –, vice president of the Warsaw Scientific Society.
Cover image: Joseph Mianowski (1804–1879). Source: From the collection of the Polish Academy of Sciences Archives in Warsaw, reference number ZF, IV-10.

Reviewers:
Dr hab. Joanna Schiller-Walicka, PAS
Dr hab. Jacek Soszyński, PAS

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data available online: http://dnb.d-nb.de



www.brill.com

Cover design: Celine van Hoek, Leiden
Production: Brill Deutschland GmbH, Paderborn

ISSN 1877-8550
ISBN 978-3-506-79472-7 (hardback)
ISBN 978-3-657-79472-0 (e-book)

# Table of Contents

# Preface to the English Language Edition

In 1795 the Polish state (to give it the narrowest of its descriptions) ceased to exist. This occurred after the third partition. The first two partitions of 1772 and 1793 had merely pruned its territory on all four sides: from the west, east, south, and north. It was a strange entity. Formally defined as Poland, it was de facto generally known as the Commonwealth of Both Nations, and also as the Polish-Lithuanian Republic. It was composed of the Crown of the Polish Kingdom, with a capital first in Cracow and then in Warsaw, and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania whose capital was Vilnius. But the biggest peculiarity of all was that despite those two names the state comprised not just Poland and Lithuania: its other key components were Ukraine and Belarus. An attempt was made in the 17th century to create a Commonwealth of Three Nations through the formation of a Grand Duchy of Rus (Ukraine) with its capital in Kyiv (the Treaty of Hadiach in 1658). Unfortunately, it ended in failure.

Throughout the 15th and 16th centuries, and in the first half of the 17th, this state was one of the mightiest in Central-Eastern Europe. It was seen as being extremely liberal, enamoured of liberties and freedom. Why was that? Probably, on the one hand, because of its broad tolerance of all faiths. In addition to the Catholics and Orthodox who constituted the majority, the republic's citizens encompassed Muslims, Judaists, and many Protestants of all shades, with naturally a predominance of Lutherans and Calvinists. On the other hand, it was a monarchy of the nobility, scrupulously safeguarding its rights, though one in which only the nobles and the clergy were privileged estates. The nobility often constituted as much as 10% of the population. As a result, some historians today even see it as an embryo of the future European Union.

Not only was the position of peasants, the middle class and of all social categories – which could be broken down in unusual detail even in the 18th century – not markedly different from that of their counterparts in the west of the European peninsula – it was worse. This concerned the liberties and social status of the middle class. And that without even mentioning the situation of the peasant population. Furthermore, the state was a mix of ethnicities. In addition to Poles and Lithuanians (in 1618, respectively four and a half million and 750.000 inhabitants), it had a population of Ruthenians (Ukrainians and Belarusians) totalling five million. In the first half of the 17th century, some 6–8% of the inhabitants were Jews. The remaining minorities, to use a modern term – Tatars, Armenians, Karaites, but also Dutch, Scots,

Germans, French and English – did not in total exceed one percent. All were termed Poles.

After the final partition, a large part of the state found itself ruled by the Russian Empire. It covered all the territories to the east of the rivers Niemen and Bug: a total of 120.000 square kilometres, as against about a million square kilometres of the entire area of the state in the first half of the 17th century. We might note that the expanse of land annexed by Russia was just short of three times the size of contemporary Netherlands, and larger by a quarter than the present territory of Portugal.

The republic of the nobles could not withstand the competition and coercion of its neighbouring absolute monarchies. The republican polity, brought in – rather late in the day, as it turned out – by the Constitution of 3 May 1791, did not favour the restoration of the state's earlier power. It is generally acknowledged that this was the first constitution in Europe, and the second in the world after the American one. Aside from Russia, large swathes of the Republic were shared out between Habsburg Austria and Hohenzollern Prussia.

It is worth emphasising that the social changes which made inroads into 18th century Europe also encompassed the Republic. However, attempts at its modernisation ultimately ended in failure. Absolutism was at the time – some would argue, even today – the most effective form of government. First and foremost, it guaranteed the state's military strength. The Republic, on the other hand, was constantly racked by financial problems, difficulties with recovering taxes and the wilfulness of a nobility averse to centralisation of the state and reform. In the 17th century, it was still an equal or even dominant player in this part of Europe. A century later, it was only a pale reflection of its former power.

What befell the Republic's inhabitants after the partitions? They became subjects of Russia, Austria, and Prussia. In the 123 years of what was termed *zabory*, 'the occupations' – from 1796 to 1918 – there were numerous attempts at restoration in diverse guises: from the Napoleonic Duchy of Warsaw (1807–1815), covering former central territories inhabited mostly by ethnic Poles, to the Polish Kingdom, established at the Congress of Vienna (and lasting till 1915), with a similar ethnic composition. But there was no *de facto* Polish state. Despite its enticing name, the Polish Kingdom was subservient to the Russian Empire, and its crowned kings were Russian tsars.

Underpinning this state of things was loyalism. Many inhabitants of the former Republic strove to live and function as loyal subjects of the Romanovs, Habsburgs, or Hohenzollerns. They were also known as 'realists', i.e., people who believed that no change whatever in the political situation was possible and it was necessary to adapt to the status quo. That they were right was confirmed by successive insurrections, all ending in defeat. Directed primarily

against Russia, the two largest took place in 1830–31 (this was known as the November Uprising and was a Polish-Russian war which came close to victory) and in 1863–64 (known as the January Uprising, with the participation not only of Poles but also of Lithuanians, Belarusians, Ukrainians and indeed Jews). In the wake of these insurrections and numerous other anti-Russian conspiracies, scores of Poles, Lithuanians, Belarusians, and Ukrainians ended up as émigrés, primarily in France (Paris) and Great Britain (London). The headcount of what is known as the great emigration in France is estimated to be at least 30.000, mainly from the military and all men. After the January Uprising of 1863–64 there was a further exodus to the West, but around 62.000 fetched up in what is broadly known as Siberia. The latest estimates are of 38.000 exiled to or resettled in Siberia, and 24.000 relocated in the northern regions of European Russia.

What was life like in the territories annexed by Russia in the 19th century? What were the views and attitudes of the Poles living in lands belonging to the Russian Empire: the vassal Polish Kingdom, Lithuania, Belarus, and a substantial part of the former crown Ukraine? How did people arrange their lives when they did not take up revolutionary action and foreswore an open struggle with the Tsarist regime? Could one be a Polish patriot without fighting gun in hand for independence? The Russians believed that Poles were genetically preordained to be anti-Russian. Even in the west of Europe this charge of morbid Russophobia was taken to be the rule, and an incurable state of mind. It seems that this was one of the greatest falsehoods that Russian imperial propaganda managed to incubate in the continent's West. The tale that unfolds below is an attempt to show the reality from the inside, through the life story of a man who served Russia and loved Poland. It also seeks to salvage a photograph of the fast-disappearing traces of the old Republic under Russian rule – seen through the prism of Polish conservatism at a time when the United Kingdom of Great Britain was ruled by George III and George IV, William IV and, finally, Queen Victoria.

Leszek Zasztowt

# Preface

*Splendid star, so happy, like an angel of youth!*
*You carry the summer on a golden ray.*
*Then, like its hope, in darkness you rest.*
*In mist-covered autumn you're shrouded today.*
*How achingly you leave the Ukrainian skies,*
*Whose beauty is mirrored in a damsel's eyes!*
*Where the air, like her visage, wafts by calm and serene,*
*Casting a spell, its breath with magic laden.*
*Where her glance is reflected in her waters' sheen,*
*Where hills are enticing, like the breast of a maiden,*
*Where harmoniously her song floats along in the breeze,*
*With her sex in the flowers, her freshness in the trees!*
Seweryn Goszczyński, *Prophetic books of Father Mark*[1]

*Our margrave's still walking the tightrope,*
*Though he's clumsy and shaped like a boar,*
*When he's fallen, he won't get a statue,*
*He'll be branded a traitorous whore.*
*Wielopolski, you'll fall to the bottom,*
*With Poland it's always the case,*
*But by that time, you will have forgotten*
*Even falling should be done with some grace.*[2]
Jerzy Czech, *The Margrave Wielopolski*

Józef Mianowski is a constant presence in the history of Polish scholarship of the 19th and 20th centuries. This is thanks mainly to the Fund of assistance for people working in the field of science named after Józef Mianowski, Doctor of Medicine, and set up in memory of the only rector of Warsaw's Main School. The Fund was an institution which before the First World War replaced the non-existent Polish ministry of science and education under Russian

1 S. Goszczyński, *Pieśni prorocze ks. Marka*, [w:] Z. Wasilewski, *Z życia poety romantycznego. Seweryn Goszczyński w Galicji: nieznane pamiętniki, utwory i listy 1832–1842*, Lwów 1910, pp. 44–45.

2 J. Czech, *Margrabia Wielopolski*, composed and performed by Przemysław Gintrowski. https://www.piosenkaztekstem.pl/opracowanie/przemyslaw-gintrowski-margrabia-wielopolski/.

occupation. Later, too, it played a significant role in supporting the development of learning in independent Poland[3].

The Mianowski Fund embedded itself in the memory of generations not only thanks to its financing of research, founding of scholarships and supporting publications. It also grew into an exemplary social institution which embraced almost all prominent Polish scholars and writers, especially at the end of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th – involving not just the elite of the Warsaw intelligentsia of the period but essentially the whole community of Poland's scholars. This was not particularly numerous, at least until the end of the 2nd Republic[4], and it would be harder to draw up a list of those who did not avail themselves of the assistance of the Mianowski Fund than to name those whom it helped as they made their way in scholarship and literature. And it needs to be added that even at the turn of the 20th century literary writing was still generally regarded as being on a par with scholarly research.

The memory of Mianowski persists. There are traces of it in the public arena, such as the hall bearing his name on the ground floor of the Kazimierzowski (Casimir) Palace, now housing the University rectorate, and the memorial inscription in the building of the former Main School being a quotation from his speech (unfortunately after refurbishment this inscription has disappeared); there is also the Mianowski street in Warsaw's Ochota district, near Narutowicz square. Mention of Mianowski is made in nearly all papers dealing with scholarship in the second half of the 19th century and to the growth of disciplines of that period, from the *belles-lettres* mentioned earlier to mathematical-nature sciences. Reactivated in 1991, the Mianowski Fund now exists as a foundation for the support of learning.

When however, we make a closer scrutiny of the sources, in search of information about the rector of the Main School and his personal life journey before taking up the position, it turns out that despite the plethora of memorial articles, all kinds of literary oddments, various *silva rerum* and *miscellanea*, there has been no single work which would present Mianowski's biography. What is

3 *Kasa Mianowskiego 1881–2011*, ed. L. Zasztowt, Warsaw 2011; P. Hübner, J. Piskurewicz, J. Soszyński, L. Zasztowt, *A History of the Józef Mianowski Fund*, transl. and ed. by J. Soszyński, Warsaw 2013; Z. Szweykowski, *Zarys historii Kasy im. Mianowskiego*, 'Nauka Polska' 1932, vol. 15, pp. 1–202; S. Fita, *Pokolenie Szkoły Głównej w życiu społecznym i kulturze polskiej*, Warsaw 1980; M. Brykalska, *Aleksander Świętochowski. Biografia*, vol. 1–2, Warsaw 1981–1987.

4 I.e. the period between the two world wars.

still the most reliable and irreplaceable summary is Stefan Kieniewicz's profile of Mianowski in the *Polish Biographical Dictionary*[5].

As Grzegorz Bąbiak observed in the latest, comprehensive edition of materials regarding the history of the Main School:

Józef Mianowski has survived only because his grateful alumni decided to erect a statue to him which was more long-lasting than bronze. Instead of a figure on a pedestal they set up a Fund which supported (and supports) the development of scholarship. But were you to ask who Mianowski was, even putting the question to the capital's university students themselves – few would be able to give an answer. The common factor for all concerned was the Warsaw Main School, mentioned above all in the biographies of its most famous graduates from the Positivist generation[6].

Mianowski was a colourful and remarkable figure. An outstanding medical practitioner, with a modest body of scholarly work, he remained in his contemporaries' memory above all thanks to his character traits – everyone emphasised his extraordinary kindness, modesty, disinterested demonstrations of help and love of people – and thanks also to a certain sentimentality and an exceptional, if rather involuntary – one might say intuitive – patriotism.

Investigating Mianowski's life story, I wondered: which was his dominant personality and character trait? Which single attribute can one pick which would define his views, his attitude in life or his world outlook? And what immediately came to my mind was the title of what is still probably the best-known book by Professor Andrzej Walicki: *In the Circle of Conservative Utopia*[7]. I asked myself: could Mianowski be in some way included in the circle of 'Russian Slavophiles' with Polish roots? But I abandoned that thought, since, firstly, Mianowski was undeniably a Polish patriot, and so if he belonged to any circle, it would be that of radical Polish Slavophiles, émigrés grouped around Joachim Lelewel or Józef Hoene-Wroński: but for them it was the Poland of the past that was the heartland of Slavism, while Russia was its negation. Secondly, at the time when Mianowski lived and worked Russian Slavophilism

5 S. Kieniewicz, *Mianowski Józef (1804–1879)*, [in:] *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* [PSB], Wrocław 1974, vol. 19, p. 523–525. Cf. Earlier biographical notes on Mianowskiego: *Encyklopedia Powszechna S. Orgelbranda*, Warsaw 1864, vol. 18, p. 452; *Encyklopedia Ogólna Wiedzy Ludzkiej, Redakcji "Tygodnika Illustrowanego"*, Warsaw 1875, vol. 9, p. 227; *Encyklopedia Powszechna S. Orgelbranda*, Warsaw 1884, vol. 7, p. 441; *Enciklopedičeskij Slovar' F. Brokgauza, I.A. Efrona*, St. Peterburg 1897, vol. 20, p. 362.

6 The Polish Positivists were a literary, philosophical, and social movement of the second half of the 19th century which eschewed revolutionary fervour and concentrated on civil society and working 'from the ground up'.

7 A. Walicki, *W kręgu konserwatywnej utopii. Struktura i przemiany rosyjskiego słowianofilstwa*, Warsaw 1964, 2nd ed. Warsaw 2002.

was first at its peak and then declined, only gaining wider social resonance in the second half of the 19th century. Furthermore, I found hardly any convincing source-based evidence that he personally knew any of the Russian Slavophiles, although they were almost all peers of his in terms of age, like Mikhail P. Pogodin (1800–1875), not to mention Alexey S. Khomiakov (1804–1860), Ivan V. Kireyevsky (1806–1856), the elder Sergey T. Aksakov (1791–1859) and the younger Ivan (1823–1886). They were indeed of the same generation as our protagonist. But their milieu was far removed from the circles that Mianowski moved in. His connections were first and foremost with Petersburg and its aristocratic elite, quite different in its thinking – at least in the first half of the 19th century – from the Russian intelligentsia of Moscow. There were some Slavophile tendencies in Petersburg too, but perhaps because their advocates were connected with the aristocracy, they did not find fertile ground. In addition, Mianowski had few acquaintances in Moscow, which was the main point of reference for the Slavophiles. The fact remains that while Mianowski served as a link man between Russian Slavophiles from aristocratic circles and Polish émigrés – also Slavophile, but in a different way – and leading members of the Polish aristocracy, there is no trace of any specific outcomes resulting from such liaisons. All we are left with, therefore, is conservatism.

Similarly, I found no source materials that would indicate that Józef Mianowski had contacts with Ukraine's Dnieper-based intelligentsia, linked to the Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius which existed in Kyiv in 1845–1847[8]. Here, though, we are dealing with a generation that is ten to 20 years younger than our protagonist. Moreover, all of them – Taras Szevchenko, Mykola (Nikolay) Kostomarov, Panteleymon Kulish, Mykola Hulak, Vasil Bilozersky – were based in Kyiv, which Mianowski rarely visited. During the time when they were active in the Brotherhood, they professed views which even then might have been too radical for Mianowski. While envisaging a future Ukraine that was in close alliance with Russia, they demanded – or at least that was their vision of the future – greater cultural freedom and, above all, an autonomous, separate space for the literary Ukrainian language that was taking shape at the time. The only member of that circle of Dnieper-based intellectuals whom Mianowski had every likelihood of knowing was Panteleymon Kulish, who in 1864–1869 worked as a clerk in Warsaw. Kulish was on good terms with several Poles, including some whom Mianowski knew well: the poet Michał Grabowski, Archbishop Ignacy Hołowiński and Józef Ignacy Kraszewski.

8 J. Gołąbek, *Bractwo św. Cyryla i Metodego w Kijowie*, Warsaw 1935; S. Kozak, *Ukraińscy spiskowcy i mesjaniści: Bractwo Cyryla i Metodego*, Warsaw 1990; J. Remy, *Brothers or Enemies: the Ukrainian National Movement and Russia, 1840s to the 1870s*, Toronto 2016.

Mianowski might even have met Kulish earlier on in the Aleksandrówka of the Grabowskis, though probably, due to the difference in age (Kulish having been born in 1819), a first meeting would have taken place in Warsaw. There is also nothing to point to any interest on Mianowski's part in the nascent separatist aspirations which at that time were gaining traction in Ukraine, and in Kyiv especially.

Mianowski's conservatism was of the liberal type: its points of reference were the ideas of such thinkers as Alexis de Tocqueville or Edmund Burke. Accordingly, it concerned itself particularly with the sphere of social values, involving a mistrust of revolution and a profound respect for family, property, religion, and nation, while broadly leaving free the economic and business area. Freedom, strictly defined, was for Mianowski the paramount value.

Mianowski was a conservative, with everything this entailed. His ideology was typical of 19th century thinking in the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The doctor aspired to be a loyal subject of the Russian emperor. At the same time, he had very close links with the leading lights of academia, aristocracy, and finance, and the upper echelons of the Roman Catholic church. Fate dictated that on a few occasions he had to manoeuvre in politically awkward situations. In essence, his problem was the need to choose between toeing the line and being loyal on the one hand, and on the other veering on the side of a dangerous Polish patriotism which in practical terms could have resulted in exile to Siberia and the end of his career. Despite the naivety sometimes ascribed to him he was able on such perilous occasions to rise to the challenge, and indeed to demonstrate personal courage. His conservatism was thus – in my opinion – less restrictive and more open to others, especially to so-called 'ordinary people', than that of Prince Jan Tadeusz Lubomirski or Margrave Aleksander Wielopolski. To some extent his compassionate attitude to people from the lower social orders found its reflection in the entire Positivist movement in Warsaw. Among the eulogists of the memory of the rector of Warsaw's Main School was none other than 'the Pope of Polish Positivism', Aleksander Świętochowski[9]. Mianowski had close friends, or people that he cared about, both in the homeland and abroad. But they included rebellious and radical students from Vilnius, Petersburg or Warsaw who could not in any way be deemed to have been supporters of compromise and realpolitik. They were certainly not conservatives: rather, they belonged with the progressive radicals of their time.

How did it happen that a man respected by the Tsar's family, personally appreciated and singled out by Nicholas I himself – known to be ill-disposed

9 Many instances of this can be found in the biography of Świętochowski by Maria Brykalska.

to Poles – and by his successor, Alexander II, a man who was liked by the elite of Petersburg aristocracy – a man, in brief, who was a typical loyalist of his time – has remained in Polish memory as a model of patriotism and national virtues, almost the equal of Romuald Traugutt, the dictator of the 1863 uprising who was executed on the hillside of Alexander's Warsaw Citadel? Why has Mianowski remained so loved, while another Pole with a similar attitude to Russia and Russians, Margrave Aleksander Wielopolski, has been condemned to eternal opprobrium in the pantheon of collective memory? Józef Mianowski's case brought into sharp relief particular Polish imponderables: organic work versus armed struggle, loyalism versus patriotism, conservatism and concession versus an intransigent stance towards the occupying power. The sensitive and emotive Mianowski, with a sentimentalism characteristic of his compatriots from the Uman' region and Ukraine, apparently acted on impulse, on the need of the moment. That he did not end his life exiled to Siberia was probably thanks to quite unusual luck, including the good fortune of finding people, Poles, and Russians, to help him along his way. Poland – as also, significantly, Russia – were his 'adopted fatherlands', although his real '*petite patrie*' was undoubtedly Ukraine, and to a lesser extent Lithuania.

In relation to Poland, a country which was then non-existent on the maps of Europe, Mianowski's stance was rather typical and characteristic of people coming from the eastern territories of the First Republic. He did not know Poland. He did not know Mazovia or Małopolska (Lesser Poland), or Wielkopolska (Greater Poland). He saw Pomerania and Silesia more as districts of the Prussian partition than – in fragments at least – historical parts of the Crown. He did not perceive Poland as an ethnographic entity. Rather, it represented to him an ideal of a lost country: the historical Commonwealth. That perception quite likely allowed him to forget that the Commonwealth was the Commonwealth of Both Nations: he would have referred to it simply as Poland. Undoubtedly, however, pride of place in his picture of that country would have been occupied by Ruthenia and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, lands which he knew from his childhood and youth. Warsaw, Kraków and Lviv, in contrast, appeared in the imagination primarily as patriotic points of reference. The reality was Uman', Vilnius and Krzemieniec, and Polish landed estates around Vilnius and in the Podole, Volhynia and Kyiv regions.

It so happened that his life journey took him to many pivotal moments in the history of Polish-Russian relations, in places were the fate of Poland and the Poles was being decided in the vast territories of the Russian partition. He studied and worked in Vilnius when it was still flourishing, but also after the closure of the city's university. It was there that he lived through both the November Uprising of 1830–1831 and the Szymon Konarski affair. It was in

Vilnius too that he witnessed the liquidation of the union of churches and the subordination of the Greek Catholic Church to the Orthodox Church in 1839.

In the 1840s and 1850s he lived in Petersburg, where he belonged to the Polish conservative elite connected with the Russian aristocracy and Tsarist establishment. From that vantage point he bore witness to the harshest repressions at the tail end of the rule of Nicolas I, but also to the first reforms introduced by the new tsar, Alexander II.

In the 1860s he created and then managed Warsaw's Main School. He also played a minor role in the events of the January Uprising of 1863–1864[10] in the Polish Kingdom. It was in Warsaw that he witnessed and experienced the repressions that followed the insurrection, the dissolution of the Main School and burgeoning Russification. In short, then, Mianowski's story mirrors the typical experiences not so much of the Polish landed gentry of the period as the travails of the Polish intelligentsia, making a living out of intellectual work. Yes, Józef Mianowski was first and foremost a member of the Polish intelligentsia: not an outstanding intellectual, perhaps, but a representative of the 'thinking class'[11]. Though he came from a family of impoverished gentry and belonged to the Polish and Russian elite, his advancement to that elite was due in large part to his own effort and perseverance.

Though not naturally inclined towards politics, he was on at least two occasions involved in political activity, though in both cases this was more by chance than by personal choice. He spent his last years as a *de facto* émigré, though remaining to the end of his life a loyal Russian subject.

It is worth pointing out one feature of Mianowski's biography. In generational terms, he belonged with the Romantics. Many of his friends and colleagues were driven by their literary work, and especially their engagement in the struggle against Russia, and the tumultuous events of the post-partition Republic, to emigrate. A whole gallery of poets and writers presents itself here, Juliusz Słowacki being the most important. From the outset, however, Mianowski was more of a Positivist. This stemmed from his profession as a doctor, but also from his character. While fascinated by literature and poetry, as were most of his contemporaries, he elected from the very start of his career to tread the path of organic work. By a strange quirk of fate he became, in

10 Named 'January' after the month in which it began, this insurrection, ultimately a failure, was a key event in 19th century Polish history.

11 An expression coined by Ryszarda Czepulis-Rastenis. See R. Czepulis-Rastenis, *"Klassa umysłowa": inteligencja Królestwa Polskiego 1832–1862*, Warsaw 1973. Cf. J. Jedlicki, *Błędne koło. Dzieje inteligencji polskiej do roku 1918*, ed. J. Jedlicki, vol. 2, Warsaw 2008, p. 169, 258; M. Micińska, *Inteligencja na rozdrożach 1864–1918. Dzieje inteligencji polskiej do roku 1918*, ed. J. Jedlicki, vol. 3, Warsaw 2008, pp. 64, 66.

the 1860s, the spiritual father of the entire Positivist movement in Warsaw, becoming the undisputed authority to Bolesław Prus, Henryk Sienkiewicz, Aleksander Świętochowski and the whole generation of the Main School. In this way his life story also holds a mirror, on a micro scale, to the history of Polish social thought and national philosophy in the 19th century. This allows to see the Poles' way of thinking in that period, and the transformation it underwent under the hammer-blows of successive national defeats. In Mianowski's case it is clear, that he bemoaned the tragic fate of his friends and colleagues, prevented from the possibility of returning to their homeland. On the other hand, he believed that for the good of the country it was necessary to remain in place and build from the foundations upwards. Although we lack convincing and unequivocal source materials to confirm this, he probably disapproved of many of their decisions regarding political activity and commitment to fighting the Tsarist empire.

Mianowski's life story has in a sense dictated the structure of this book, whose five main sections correspond to his geographical peregrinations. The first covers his Ukrainian period – particularly his schooling in Uman', but also a short and far from complete genealogy of the Mianowski family. The second, and most substantial, concerns Lithuania, and in particular Vilnius, in which Mianowski attained general acclaim and professional success. The third part is an account of Mianowski's situation in Russia, living in the Empire's capital, Petersburg. It was there that the medical practitioner earned the permanent gratitude not only of the imperial family and the aristocratic elite of the city but also of countless Poles whom he helped in a variety of ways through difficult times. Petersburg also proved, contrary to his own expectations, to be a springboard that took him to the next phase of his career – in Warsaw, in the Polish Kingdom. The fourth section relates Mianowski's activities there, principally in the city's Main School. The fifth deals with the least known part of his life: he moved to Italy to spend his last years there, in Senigallia on the Adriatic coast.

The book draws on a broad database of sources which is ample but not homogeneous, and, is rather uneven in tracing the life journey of Józef Mianowski. Thus, details on his final years are scarce while the previous periods of Uman', Vilnius, Petersburg and Warsaw are reasonably well documented. Materials that have been accessed come from the Russian State Historical Archives in Petersburg, the Lithuanian State Historical Archives in Vilnius and the State Archives of the Capital City of Warsaw; use has also been made of small compilations of letters to be found in the collections of unpublished correspondence of the National Library in Warsaw, the Jagiellonian Library in Kraków, the Polish Academy of Sciences (PAN) Archives in Warsaw and the PAN and

Polish Academy of Sciences and Letters (PAU) Archives in Kraków, the National Ossoliński Institute in Wrocław and the Kórnik and Rapperswil libraries.

Much use has also been made of materials in print: numerous memoirs, and correspondence, in particular that of Hersylia née Bécu; Teofil of the Januszewskis; and Juliusz Słowacki, Seweryn Goszczyński and Józef Bohdan Zaleski. Other sources include papers on the history of institutions: of the Uman' county Basilian school, the University of Vilnius, the Vilnius Medical-Surgical Academy, the Medical-Surgical Academy in Warsaw, and Warsaw's Main School. An important source of information was provided by the various articles dispersed among the 19th century periodicals of Vilnius, Warsaw, and Petersburg, and of Lviv and Kraków. It would be useful at this point to emphasise the contribution of the Warsaw lawyer, bibliophile, and philanthropist Leopold Méyet, who was the first to take up the task of researching the biography of our protagonist.

⁂

In 1868 – the year before the Main School was dissolved – Mianowski was rector and full professor of the Main School, permanent member council of the curator of the Warsaw Scientific Circle (of the Ministry of Education), member of the Medical Council of the Polish Kingdom. He was vice-president of the Zachęta Society of Fine Arts in the Kingdom, as well as chairman of the private board of Warsaw's Hospital of the Baby Jesus. He had been awarded class IV – one of the highest – ranks of a councillor state. He was Knight of the Order of St Anne 1st Class, St Stanislae 1st Class and St Vladimir 2nd class. He had been distinguished for 25 years of exemplary service and had two dark bronze medals: one for achievements in the 1853–1856 Turkish war and the other in recognition of his help in suppressing the 'Polish rebellion'[12] of 1863–1864. Seven years after the abolition of the Main School, in 1876, he also received the order of St Vladimir, 2nd Class, and a 12-year stipend amounting to 2500 roubles per year[13]. Those last distinctions, which were awarded to him some three years before his death, he owed to the protection of Field Marshal Prince Alexander I. Bariatynsky, the personal intervention of the minister of public goods Piotr A. Valuyev, and the good will of two Warsaw governors – the former one, Fyodor F. Berg and the incumbent, Pavel J. Kotzebue.

12 Rossijskij Gosudarstvennyj Istoričeskij Arhiv v Sankt Peterburgie [RGIA], fond [f.] 733, opis' [op.] 147, edinica hranenă [e.hr.] 752, Formulărnyj spisok o službe, sheet (k.) 3.

13 S. Kieniewicz, *Mianowski Józef (1804–1879)*, p. 524.

So how did Mianowski, 72 years of age at the time, manage to hold on to such influence in Petersburg and yet not lose hold of his popular support in Warsaw?

Was he really a typical loyalist, as appears from the archives about his service along the successive steps up the ladder of imperial hierarchy of officialdom? Or did he do everything to conceal his Polish patriotism and, as many of his compatriots, was one more example of 'Wallenrodyzm'[14]? He loved and understood the Poland of the past, or more precisely what remained of the heritage of the former Commonwealth. What, though, was his real attitude towards Russia? Did he hate it, or love it? Or did he perhaps simply use his Petersburg prism to treat it as a cosmopolis, a perfect place to further his career and enjoy financial success? Might Russia for him have been Petersburg – a city of glitter and opportunities, like Paris? Such questions unfold themselves as we ask them. Perhaps we can answer at least a few.

14 After the hero of *Konrad Wallenrod* – a novel in verse by Poland's leading romantic poet Adam Mickiewicz – who employs deceit and subterfuge in pursuit of noble aims.