

Tuija Pulkkinen

VALTIO

– *On the Conceptual History of the Finnish ‘State’*

In 1809, the Finnish estates were convened by the Russian Emperor, Alexander I, in the town of Porvoo to confirm the result of the Napoleonic Wars in North-Eastern Europe, the handing over of Finland from Sweden to the Russian Empire. In Swedish, the meeting was referred to as *Landtag*, there was no mention of the Swedish word *stat* in connection to it, and the Finnish word *valtio* (the state), had not even been created, yet the conception of the Porvoo meeting as the birth place of the “Finnish state” is firmly rooted. Osmo Jussila has argued that this conception is a case of the misuse of words, which is historically the result of conscious political maneuvering on the part of successful 19th century political players (such as Israel Hwasser, Johan Jacob Nordström, Johan Vilhelm Snellman, Robert Castrén and Leo Mechelin)¹. Nonetheless, other prominent Finnish historians, such as Matti Klinge, find a sufficient number of reasons to continue referring to the Porvoo meeting as founding place of the Finnish state.²

Analysis of separate concepts of state has not been absent in the historians’ debate on this issue, rather, quite the opposite is true. Jussila argues that “*stat*” was used in early 19th century documents in the old meaning of a budgetary unit (finance state), but was twisted into the modern concept of state by those who later put forward the

idea of Finland as a contract party in Porvoo. He also holds that the concept of nation in the Porvoo documents was the old notion by which all provinces of the Swedish empire had been considered as nations. Contrarily, Klinge argues that when taking his oath in Porvoo, the Russian Emperor used the term “nation of Finland” in the new meaning informed by the French Revolution.³ These conceptual distinctions are not insignificant, yet, considering the centrality of the dispute about the birth of the Finnish state, there has been surprisingly little systematic study and analysis of actual usage of words *stat* and *valtio* informed by the methods of conceptual history.

A common view is expressed by Päiviö Tommila, who writes about the beginning of 19th century Finland that: “Finns who wanted to emphasize the new position of Finland used the word state more often [than Russians]”. Referring to professor of law, J. J. Nordström’s lectures, which in the 1840’s established the view of the Finnish state as a contracting party at the Porvoo meeting, he adds that: “from the same time period also derives the word *valtio*.”⁴ The implication in this statement is that the birth of the Finnish term for the state, ‘*valtio*’, is a direct consequence of the political activity in favor of the separate position of Finland within the Russian Empire, and is closely connected to the conception of Finland as a contracting party in the meaning of international law, on which Jussila’s argument also centers. With respect to these accounts, it is surprising to go back to the texts dating from the 1840s and apply a conceptual history approach. According to my findings, it seems to be that the very first mentions of *valtio* in Finnish in the 1840’s had little to do with the relation of Finland to Russia. Even more interesting, however, is that the early use of the word does not even seem to be in accordance with that standard usage of ‘the state’ in which it may function as a subject in sentences, and in which it is understood as an entity that may contract, that is, as a sovereign power, authority or agency. Instead, *valtio* seems to have been adopted, as I will show, very much as a means to linguistically express either the structure of a polity or the political nature of action by individuals. Especially the latter usage, which renders ‘politics’ and ‘the state’ conceptually exceptionally close to each other is of particular interest to a political theorist and points to distinguishable local features of political culture.

In this paper I am concerned with such local features of Finnish political culture which can be discerned by analyzing the conceptual scene of the concept and word state (*valtio*) during the first half of the 19th century in Finland with the means of approach that has lately been named as “conceptual history”. In the beginning of my article I will specify what I understand by conceptual history, as well as define my position in terms of particular antagonisms within this field of study. I will then exercise the approach in the context of the Finnish ‘state’ by looking closely at the beginning phases of the Finnish word *valtio* after which I will conclude with remarks on the distinguishable features of Finnish political culture that are connected with the usage of ‘state’. What I present here is a work in progress, related to my contribution to the Finnish project of the history of political concepts.⁵

Conceptual History

‘Conceptual history’ refers today to a variety of philosophically informed linguistic-historical work on chiefly political concepts, the prime examples being Reinhart Koselleck’s work in the context of the German *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* project and Quentin Skinner’s and John Pocock’s work in the Anglophone world. The common denominator for any work in conceptual history is undoubtedly an interest in language, as well as in the changes in concepts. As Melvin Richter, a well known advocate of conceptual history in United States, remarks, the German *Begriffsgeschichte* addresses many issues which English speaking readers identify with “the linguistic turn”, and this matches the growing concern with language, which within historical research results from dissatisfaction with earlier methods in intellectual history, the history of ideas and the history of political and social thought.⁶

The *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* project is based on an original interest in social history and far-reaching social changes, and Koselleck’s thinking involves adherence to a notion of pre-conceptual and pre-linguistic “experience” as a foundation for conceptual change. Quentin Skinner’s thinking, on the contrary, is focused on the linguistic acts of those who change political language, since his, as well as Pocock’s

thought derives initial inspiration in J. L. Austin's speech act theory. Despite their differences, both these approaches, and conceptual history in general, can be seen as differing from the traditional history of ideas approach predominantly in terms of their interest in language and by their tendency to take language seriously.

Among the particular areas of dispute within the practicing conceptual historians lie a number of philosophical and methodological positions, concerning issues such as the relation of a word to a concept, or whether to study a wide array of textual sources or, rather, texts by particular influential language users. In the following I will consider my approach to the most significant of these areas of dispute. In addition, I will provide a particular reflection of these points of view in respect to my topic here, the early history of the concept of state in Finland.

The first area of complex issues is the relationship of words, concepts, meanings and ideas. At the one end of the spectrum there are those whose interest lies in words, who work on a detailed philological analysis of frequencies and grammatical forms of words in texts, and who tend to identify the concept with the word. At the other end there are those who insist on the analysis of meanings instead of words. They tend to identify the concept with a meaning, and consider concepts as detached from words. I think the latter view is hard to maintain without falling back on the history of ideas, but in respect to the antagonism between the two views, my position lies in emphasizing the need to pay attention to both words and ideas. In fact, the entire point of conceptual history lies precisely in this combination. The changes of concepts do not merely occur as changes in words, nor do they occur as changes without words. A mere philological analysis does not constitute a conceptual analysis, however, there is also no sense in having "concepts" with no textual mark. The first principle of any conceptual history, I think, is that there is adequate attention paid to both concepts and words, not merely to one or the other.

This implies a great deal of significance in terms of in what language and in what particular signs a specific idea is present. When analyzing the concept of state in last century Finland this is particularly challenging, because there were two languages present on the same stage. The political vocabulary of the Finnish language experienced a hectic "boiling point" during the period of the 1840s

and 1850s, when a large percentage of the present vocabulary was purposefully coined by the fennomanian language reformers promoting the use of Finnish instead of Swedish in public life. Analyzing the usage of key political concepts in Finnish thus always involves investigating the usage of words both in Finnish and Swedish.

A second area of dispute, connected with the previous one, is the issue of the possible presence of a concept despite there not being a word available in the language to express it. One could say that this was the case in Finnish when the word *valtio* was coined to express something that needed expression. I take it for granted that within a conceptual history approach this kind of “need” must be taken into consideration. There are certain concepts that “seek” expression, that is, that “are” prior to the existence of words to express them. Still, I think that they “are” there, in waiting, not necessarily as a result of new “experiences” or specific “intentions” that are independent of conceptual frameworks, but rather as the result of clashes, of meeting with other languages, and they always exist in an inescapable connection to existing conceptual frameworks in the form of a chain of negations. Simultaneously, the new unprecedented consequences of conceptual moves always occur as a result of both clashes of languages and as a consequence of deliberate action.

The third question of key concepts is related to this. It is convenient to start from an a-priori that, for example, the state is such a key concept in political thought that sooner or later it must find expression in the vocabulary of all languages. It is crucial, though, not to fall too easily for universalizing assumptions which undoubtedly are made on the basis of hegemonic political cultures. In principle, there are no key-concepts that a-priori would constitute a political system. One needs to keep one’s mind open to possibilities of different conceptualizations. Instead of simply following the settling of the old European notion of ‘the state’ in Finnish vocabulary, it is crucial to keep in mind that, it could also not have settled, and indeed, when an “equivalent” was created in language it did by no means directly correspond its counterparts in other languages. It is precisely the subtle and less subtle differences in this respect that are of interest to a student of political culture.

My fourth remark concerns the methods of conceptual history. A very good starting point for an analysis is, I think, to focus on the

semantic field surrounding a given concept, as is done in the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* project. This includes examining the concept in terms of its synonyms, antonyms and other associated terms; including onomasiological analysis, the study of different terms which refer to a similar thing or concept, and semasiological analysis, which attempts to cover the different meanings of a particular term. I have sought to apply this kind of analysis to the concept of state and the word *valtio* in Finnish around the time when it was taken into use, in 1848. I have paid specific attention to counter-concepts, and when analyzing the usage of words, the grammatical form in which the term appears in texts, its grammatical function in sentences and the typical compounds it is encountered in have proved to be of great interest.

There are those who view a broad analysis of the prevalent use of words as opposed to an approach which takes seriously the linguistic acts of particular language users. I think it is essential to pay considerably attention to both, and I see no difficulty in combining both aspects. I think a conceptual history approach involves paying attention to specific acts and moves, efforts by particular language users to influence the formation of a concept and alter the established meanings in the form of a Skinnerian type of analysis of speech-acts. The successes and failures of such attempts are of interest. My study has taken a particular interest in the concept producing action by Johan Vilhelm Snellman, the philosopher and political leader whose influence, I think, has in a peculiar way been both over- and underestimated by historians when considering the fight over the conceptual hegemony of the terms 'state' and 'nation' in Finland.⁷

Following these initial remarks, I will proceed by exploring the concept of state in the period of its linguistic formation in Finnish in the late 1840s.

Valtio

The word *valtio* in Finnish is one of the young words purposely coined in order to translate a word from other languages or, perhaps, to correspond to a certain concept or several concepts that did not find expression in the existing vocabulary. According to the linguist, Martti

Rapola, who has extensively studied the first occurrences of words in Finnish, the word *valtio* was first used in place of the Swedish word *stat* by Paavo Tikkanen in the year 1847 in a publication entitled *Lukemisia Suomen kansalle Hyödyksi*, which was published by one of the regional student clubs (*Pohjalainen osakunta*)⁸. The interest in constructing a word that would be equivalent to the Swedish word *stat* was clearly shown in the rich array of coinages that preceded *valtio* in mid 19th century Finnish. It was suggested that *stat* be translated as *walde*, and the words *valdelma*, *wallasto*. The more Finnish sounding *valle* as well as the adjective *valteinen* are also encountered in literature of that period.⁹

Apparently, *valtio* was about to acquire a stable status. In the Swedish-Finnish dictionary published in 1853 by D.E.D. Europaeus, there is an entry *stat* (*rike*), which is translated as *Walta-kunta*, *waltio*, *walta*. Europaeus mentions 57 Swedish words beginning with *stat*, and eight of them are translated with the word *waltio* as a component.¹⁰ Others he translates with the words *walta-kunta* [realm], *hallitus* [government], *maa-kunta* [land, county] and *walta* [power].¹¹ Only twelve years later, Ahlman, in his Swedish-Finnish dictionary (1865), presents 80 words beginning with *stat* and struggles to express nearly all of them with the term *waltio*¹². Not all of these translations survived much further.¹³

Valtio is an expression intentionally created by the fennomanian language reformers in a situation in which the existing vocabulary for one reason or another was felt not to be sufficient or satisfactory. There were expressions in Finnish which were conceptually very close to *valtio*, such as *valtakunta* [realm, kingdom; Sw. *Rike*, Ger. *Reich*], *valta* [power. Sw. *Makt*, Ger. *Macht*], and *hallitus* [government; Sw. *Regering*, Ger. *Regierung*], but *valtio* was intended to be at exact equivalent to the Swedish *stat* or to specific aspects of it. *Stat* had been used in the Swedish language since the 16th century, and it merges with the European tradition of the concept of the state (*status* > *stato*, *l'état*, *Staat*, state, *stat*).

One could, of course, ask why the differentiation now sought after, had not occurred before and was not linguistically present in Finnish, and also why it occurred at this particular moment. In order to examine what exactly happened, one needs to link the Finnish conceptual history with the studies on the European history of

concepts, and examine which exact aspect of the concept that is present in other languages and particularly which exact meaning of the Swedish word *stat valtio* was originally intended to express. In other words, what was the purpose for which the fennomanian linguistic architects most acutely needed the new word *valtio*? In order to get closer to answering this question, I will briefly examine the European history of the concept of state, as well as the Swedish usage of the word *stat*.

The European Concept of State

The concept of state and the words *stat*, *Staat*, state, *état*, *stato*, deriving from the Latin *status*, have gone through various transformations, which have been analyzed in various studies on the European history of concepts. In his article entitled *The State* (1989) Quentin Skinner follows the conceptual development up until what he calls the “modern concept of state”. The modern concept of state, according to him, is characterized by a double abstraction: the state is understood as separate from both the rulers and the ruled.

The Latin term *status* (and its equivalents *état*, *stato* and state) was already in use in a variety of political contexts as early as the 14th century. During this formative period, these terms were employed predominantly to refer to the state or the standing of rulers themselves, to a certain condition of stateliness that belonged to kings, and was rarely used alone without a qualification. Later, during the slow process of change, it was used to designate an area, the lands or territories of a prince. Another transformation took place when the term state was no longer used only to designate the idea of a prevailing regime, but also to refer to the institution of government. Thus, according to Skinner, in the oldest history of the concept, the state was predominantly not separated from those who rule.

According to Skinner, we initially encounter a vindication of the idea that there is a distinct form of “civil” or “political” authority which is wholly autonomous in quattrocento Florentine thought, and in the works of the classical republican theorists. Skinner connects this thought to the later popular sovereignty theorists, who speak of civil

or political authority, or as Locke refers to it, of “true original extent and end of civil government”. However, Skinner notes that republican theorists (as well as Locke) embrace only one half of the doubly abstract notion of the state. They insist with full self-awareness upon a categorical distinction between the state and those who have control of it, but on the other hand, they make no comparable distinction between the power of the state and that of its citizens.

According to Skinner, the idea of the state as being distinct from both the power of the people and of their magistrates emerged as a byproduct of those writers who were critical of the theses of popular sovereignty. From the texts of Hobbes, Bodin, Suarez, and Marsilius, there emerges an expression for a power which has been completely transferred from the sovereignty of the people, which is alienated and not just delegated. The power thereby installed, as Hobbes states, has authority that has its own rights and properties, which neither any one citizen, nor all of them together possess. In this way, a single and supreme sovereign authority is established which is distinct from the people who originally instituted it, but also from all possible office-holders who, for a designated period of time have the right to wield its power.

Skinner does not refer to Hegel in this article, but as far as I can see, it would not be incorrect to refer to Hegel’s concept of state as “modern” in the context of Skinner’s analysis. Hegel’s *Staat* which was relevant in the context of the political thought in Finland in the beginning of the 19th century, is, of course, a German concept. Reinhart Koselleck, in his short article included in the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, describes the history of the concept “die Staat” in Germany.

According to Koselleck, the Latin term *status* had already been translated into German as *Staat* in the 15th century, but did not become a theoretical concept in German until in the end of the 18th century. According to Koselleck, this was due to the political reality in Germany: the German nobility (*Fürste*), together, the *Reichstag* and the *Kaiser*, never formed a single agency. The *Reich* never became a state in the French sense of the word. That is why up until the end of the 18th century the term *Staat* was used exclusively to refer to the status of the estate, especially its high status and the status of power, often in combinations such as *Fürstenstaat*. While

the combination “sovereign state” was already introduced in French in the 17th century, it only began to be used in German in the 19th century. After the French Revolution, the word *Staat* became more frequently used in Germany, while in France “*l’état*” was replaced by the terms *republique* and *empire*.

Koselleck describes the conceptual history of the German term *Staat* through the metaphor of an hourglass. Before the beginning of the 19th century, the word had several scattered meanings. Around the year 1800, the meanings became condensed: *Staat* began to be monopolized by one meaning. It became crystallized as something that Koselleck, like Skinner, calls a “modern state”. According to Koselleck, during this period the state became an agency (*Handlungs-subjekt*) with a will of its own, “a grand person”, an organism and organization. According to Koselleck, the state became, in a word, a collective individual, a *persona moralis*. After going through the narrow waist of the hourglass, the concept of the state once again began to appear in plural meanings. Such concepts as *Rechtsstaat*, *Kulturstaat* and *Sozialstaat* began to surface.

As in opposition to the old status-notations and the connection to estates, the modern concept of state appears in the accounts of Quentin Skinner and Reinhart Koselleck either as an abstract power clearly separated from the ruler/s and the ruled or as a *Handlungs-subjekt*, an agency. As is well known, the modern state has also been characterized as the agency within society which possesses a monopoly on legitimate violence. It is also often characterized as the institution or set of institutions concerned with the enforcement of order.¹⁴ All these conceptions seem to unanimously refer to the state in terms of a power or agency.

As I will later argue more precisely, an interesting feature in the early, and also quite late, use of the Finnish term *valtio* is that it does not predominantly adhere to the aspect of the power and agency of the state, and that it is not because of the dominance of the older European status-notation. To clarify this peculiarity, it would be wise to begin by closely considering the Swedish use of the word *stat*, and by examining which aspects of it the Finnish language reformers had in mind and emphasized when they created the Finnish word.

The Swedish Word *Stat*

In the most extensive dictionary of the Swedish language, *Svenska Akademiens Ordbok*, the word *stat* is given three basic meanings, the last two of which are marginal.¹⁵ The first is divided into five relevant meanings, which I list here in abbreviated form:

I: the status, state or state of affairs of somebody, particularly the social status, estate, or style of living according to the estate, or style of living that shows the status, or grandiose style of living.

II: servants in a country house, manor, home or guards at a court, the group of people following a person of influence, a court; the personnel in a civil or military organization, a guard.

III: a table or instructions of how a certain affair should be conducted, a report of financial situation; a budget; personnel and the pay-list; a contract.

IV: A payment in goods and services or in cash for a court; supporting, maintaining non-rulers (in a court), supporting the poor and the sick, a compensation in goods and serv

ices or in cash, wage, salary, income; a certain number of personnel, servants; taxes

V: Realm, kingdom, country, public power, office; republic

Inside meaning V: 1); organized society

a) state (the state Germany etc.; b) small states that belonged to Sweden before the time of the nation-state (as 1802: “Swea, Göta, Norrland, Finland, Lappland, Pommern, Rügen and; c) states as parts of a state (as the states of the United States); d) “the Scandinavian state” of Norway-Sweden e) in the expression *makter och stater* f) (vanished meaning) a republic, esp. In contrast to *rik* in the meaning monarchy; g) together with the word *fri* [free] in the 18th and 19th century for. ex. about Holland; h) in particular expressions connected with a name of an institution, such as *statens järnvägar* [The State Railways]; i) in the expression *Man i staten*, [Man in state] (a civil servant or more generally a “regular person”); j) state in contrast to church; k) in the expression *stat i or inom staten* [the state in a the state]; l) metaphorically of something that resembles a state for ex. of a community of insects or of the “God’s state”.

It is quite evident that at the time when the term *valtio* was introduced into the Finnish vocabulary, meanings 2), 3) or meanings I-IV

of the meaning 1) of the word *stat* were of no interest to the inventors. It was exclusively meaning V that *valtio* was intended to convey.

This observation makes it possible to precipitate some primary contours in the peculiarity of the conceptual field of *valtio* in Finnish. It is very interesting to note that because of the concentration on meaning V, the rest of the connotations of *stat* (I-IV), many of which it shares with the *stat*-vocabulary of other European languages, are not carried over into the Finnish term *valtio*. As a word, *valtio* is not at all reminiscent of the status or state of something, and it does not bring to mind everyday concerns on a large land-owner's estate or court life.

There are some other words in Finnish that carry the rest of the connotations of *stat*. The word *tila* [estate, farm] with its derivations: for example, statistics is *tilasto*, and state of affairs is *asiantila*. The word *sääty* [estate, class] also has some connotations; the adjective *säädyllinen* means proper (behavior) or (behavior) according to one's status. One could say that in comparison to an attempt to express *stat* with a word connected to either *tila* or *sääty*, the choice *valtio* clearly shows that the concept in question is not the pre-modern European concept. It is not someone's (the prince's) state, nor is it in a concrete relation to land, and it is clearly a post French Revolution concept with a negative relation to the idea of division into estates or classes.

Svenska Akademiens Ordbok, with its purely linguistic ambition, does not, however, enable a conceptual analysis beyond this point. It does not differentiate between diverse uses within meaning V of *stat*, and this is the point at which the interest of a political theorist awakens. In order to come closer to an answer to the question of the specific need for the word *valtio* in Finnish at the time of the introduction of the term, one has to distinguish diverse uses of *stat* within meaning V in a content sensitive way. I will return to this commitment later with an analysis of the terms available for expressing things close to the state in Finnish, and with a suggestion for a differentiation between the diverse discourses of state, which according to my reading have a specific hierarchy among them with regard to the invention of a new word *valtio* in Finnish¹⁶.

Before that, however, it is proper to examine a particular language user who greatly influenced the conceptual realm of Finnish politics in its formation years.

J. V. Snellman, a philosopher, publicist, professor and later a senator, although himself writing in Swedish, held a special position in the minds of the fennomanian language reformers. It seems probable that traces of the specific concept of state in the writings of Snellman, who was evidently one of the most influential thinkers of the fennomanian movement, are present in the subsequent political thought and remain in the consequent political language. Indeed, studying Snellman’s use of the word *stat* and the position of the state in his philosophical system seems to shed light to the particularities of the Finnish *valtio*.

J. V. Snellman

As a philosopher, Snellman developed a system that very closely follows Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel’s, and deviates from it only in particular, although often significant, points. Snellman’s concept *stat* is very close to Hegel’s *Staat*, but there is simultaneously an intriguing dissimilarity, which is significant for the term *valtio*.¹⁷

In Snellman’s system of concepts, as in Hegel’s, the Hegelian concept of *Sittlichkeit*, in Swedish *sedlighet*, is extremely central to the concept of state. The English translation of *Sittlichkeit*, ‘ethical life’, does not carry over the crucial element of *Sitten* [mores, habits, customs] as does the Swedish *sedlighet*, deriving from *sed*, which has the same meaning as *die Sitte*.

Sittlichkeit/Sedlighet, which in a Hegelian system is differentiated from ‘the natural right’ and ‘morality’, unites the points of view of abstract law and personal morality, transforming them into a view of social life with a special emphasis on the element of traditions carried over from former generations in the form of habits and customs. *Sittlichkeit/sedlighet*, in other words, joins formal law and inner morality as aspects of social life, and adds to it the ideal of a social change which respects the “inner” development of communal feelings of right and wrong. The state in both Hegel’s and Snellman’s system is *Sittlichkeit/sedlighet* in its purest form.

Snellman’s emphasis when considering *sedlighet*, and consequently ‘the state’, is slightly different from Hegel’s. In order to understand

Snellman's thought it is crucial to realize that for him, the concept of *sedlighet* represents a specific kind of action. In Snellman's use it combines legality and morality as attributes of action, meaning the quality of acting law-abiding and observing the existing habits on the one hand, and on the basis of one's own conscience and decision on the other. For Snellman, who sees himself as revising Hegel's thought, this combination, with a special emphasis on the component of morality, is of exceptional significance.

If action is normally conceived of as either following external rules or as autonomous, then Snellman can be seen as striving in political thought to overcome this dichotomy and to achieve a vocabulary in which it would not function. If, for example, in present day Swedish or Finnish one was able to say that a person "acted *siveellisesti*"¹⁸ [sedlig, sittlich] or "acted in *valtio*", in a way which would immediately convey the thought of a person who in his/her acting accepts and is conscious of his/her cultural tradition, norms and laws and simultaneously relates to his/her culture in a creative way, then one could say that Snellman's political vocabulary is still alive today. However, it is impossible to express all of this in one word in present day Swedish or Finnish – in this respect, the Snellmanian terminology was not victorious in the long run. The term *sedlighet/siveellisyys* did not survive to the present in terms of its possessing a political meaning closely connected to the state. Still, I would argue – and I will show this later – some aspects of this meaning were preserved in the Finnish use of the concept of state.

The main counter-concept of 'the state' in Snellman's system is 'civil society', [Sw. *medborgerligt samhälle*],¹⁹ and Snellman distinguishes the two as distinct types of action. Within civil society, the attitude connected to action is law-abiding, whereas within the state there is an additional attitude of creating something new: the agent positions him/herself as law-creating. In other words, 'action within civil society' (*verksamheten i medborgerliga samhället*) is a name for such an action in which the agent follows external rules, and 'action within the state' (*verksamheten i staten*) is the name for such an action in which the agent creates new rules. In Snellman's thought, these concepts are not differentiated according to specific areas of action, one can act as a school-teacher either 'within civil society' or 'within the state'. In the former case, one follows the existing norms of a school-teacher, in the

latter, one aims at reforming the existing norms according to one’s own moral reflection concerning the common good. Consequently, action within civil society does not fully correspond the notion of *Sittlichkeit/sedlighet*, as it lacks the element of morality, whereas action within the state includes both legality and morality.

The concept of the state is also closely connected to the idea of the general will in the Hegelian vein. In Snellman’s thought the general will is very clearly constructed by and visible in the action of political agents. The ‘action within the state’ corresponds to action with intention to approximate the general will by aiming at the common good. When ‘acting within civil society’ an agent strives to satisfy his²⁰ own interest, when ‘acting within the state’ an agent acts with the common good in mind. Consequently, the function of the general will – a construction embedded in the concept of the state in Snellman’s thought – is that it serves as a horizon of the right and the criterion for good judgement in politics. A typical Snellmanian phrase about the state is: “Ethical life [*Sedlighet*] is in the state in a form that completely corresponds to its concept: in short an individual should act as the community acts, but there is nobody to tell him how it would act. He himself must decide what the will of the community is.” The Snellmanian state concept thus designates a special kind of action – action that is characterized by *sedlighet*, which means that the individual positions himself as an independent interpreter of the community’s will, designating its future based on its tradition.

The aforementioned philosophically defined concept of state in the system of concept does not cover all the uses of ‘the state’ by Snellman in his various texts. Snellman took part in contemporary discussions in non-philosophical terms, and *stat* most often appears in his texts in other than philosophical meanings.²¹ But, if we pick up and pay attention to his peculiar phrase ‘*verksamheten i staten*’ [action within state], something very interesting appears. In comparison to standard definitions of state as a power, an agent etc., and in contrast to either Skinner’s or Koselleck’s portrayals of the modern concept of the state, Snellman’s concept of state does not invite its use as a subject in sentences, but instead in *verksamheten i staten*, *stat* strives to define a specific kind of *verksamhet*. An interesting feature of the Snellmanian conceptual framework, therefore, is that

with this state-concept of his one could not say that the state acts, owns or wills something, or even that the state aims at something, because the state is not an agent, a subject of action, but is rather an attribute of action.

Particularly interesting is that a similar action-oriented dimension of the state concept seems to be present in the use of language during the process of the fennomanian translation of the word *stat* in the 1840's. Let us now take a closer look at the linguistic needs at that time. This means determining the linguistic possibilities in the conceptual field of 'the state' prior to the introduction of the word *valtio*, and looking at how distinct words were used, in order to see what was lacking.

Linguistic Possibilities prior to *Valtio* and the Discourses of 'the State'

Before *valtio*, the words most commonly used to refer to a state and or other states in meaning V:1 of *Svenska Akademiens Ordbok*, were *valta* [power], *ulkovallat* [literally "outside powers"] *valtakunta* [realm, kingdom], *kruunu* [the crown], *maa* [country, land], *maakunta* [land, county, region, province], *Suomi*, *Ruotsi* etc. [Finland, Sweden etc.], *Suomenmaa* [Suomiland], *isänmaa* [fatherland], *me* [us], *meillä* [at home]. Most of these words remain in use today. With the new position within the Russian Empire, the expressions *suuriruhtinaanmaa* [The land of the Grand Duke] and *suuriruhtinaskunta* [Grand Duchy] came into use.

For example, the official documents of the transitional period from the Swedish to the Russian Empire, which at the time were translated into Finnish, used various combinations of the aforementioned terms as well as *Suomen-maa* [Land of Finland], *maakunta* [land, province] *maa* [land], *Suuren ruhtinaan-maa*, [Land of the Grand Duke], *Suomi* [Finland]. Extracts of two documents from this period, (1) the 23.12.1808 circular letter of G.M. Sprengtporten after having been nominated as the general governor of Finland and (2) The Emperor's oath at Porvoo 29.3.1809, as well as a third document from a later time, (3) an appeal by the peasants of the Mikkeli region

to annul the language regulations in 1854, written by Antti Manninen, are attached to the end of this article in order to illustrate the word use in translations into Finnish and in written Finnish.

In analyzing the initial coining situation of *valtio* it is useful to examine which concepts functioned as counter-concepts for the state. It is equally interesting to examine which expressions were used nearly synonymously, and exactly how the usage of these nearly synonymous words differs from the usage of *valtio*; in what grammatical form and in what grammatical position the word is used within a sentence – for example, when is it used as a subject (“the state takes care”), when as an adjective (*valtiollinen*, [stately] like “stately matters, occupations, calling” or when in specific compounds, such as “*valtiomuoto*” [constitution, “the form of the state”], “*valtiopäivät*” [diet, assembly, “state- days”] “*valtiollis-yhteiskunnallinen*” [social-political, “stately-societal”], “*valtio ja kunta*” [“the state and the commune”].

In the first volume of the leading fennomanian newspaper, *Suometar*, published in 1847,²² the word *valtio* occurs in various forms 13 times. Once as a synonym for *valtakunta* [Ger. *Reich*, Sw. *Rike*]²³, 6 other times as an adjective²⁴, 6 times in the compound of *valtiopäivät* and once in the form of *valtio-neuvos*. [Sw. *Stats-råd*]. *Valtakunta* [realm] is used 22 times, several times in expressions like *valtakunnan asiat* [affairs of the state], which soon after is more frequently expressed as *valtiolliset asiat* [“stately” affairs]²⁵. When used in the economic meaning, the Swedish *stat* did not seem to require a translation in terms of *valtio*.²⁶

The 1848 volume of *Suometar* was filled with news of the European political upheavals and constitutional meetings. The word *valtiopäivät* [diet, literally state-days in pl.], or *valtiopäivä* [diet, literally state-day, in sing.] occurs frequently and clearly stabilizes itself; there are 60 occurrences in the 1848 *Suometar*. In the meaning connected with international law, *valtio* appears 6-7 times, in a political (interior political, administrative apparatus) meaning 11 times, of which the polity tone is present in 4 occurrences. The adjective *valtiollinen* appears 5 times, and in addition there some occurrences of *valtio* in particular compounds, such as *yksivaltio*, *liittovaltio*, *kirkkovaltio* *valtiovarain* (*ministeri*) [single state, federal state, church state, minister of state finances].

On the basis of leafing through various texts from different periods of time²⁷, it seems to me that the *valtio*-vocabulary can be ex-

amined as divided into a few clearly separate areas of use, or discourses, some of which had already established themselves by the time the word *valtio* was taken into use, and some of which were established at that time. These are: 1) “international” or “international law” usage (states in war, relations between states, the interest of a state, foreign states, other states (often used in plural form “states”). 2) The economical use (state economy, ruled by the state, taken in the control of the state, was bought by the state, is realized by the state means, a state company, is in the service of the state, is employed by the state, the state feeds, the state pays etc.) 3) The administrative use (the state organs, the state administration, a state servant [*Gr. Beamter*]) 4) The juridical use (*valtiosääntö*) [constitution, literally “the rule of state”, Sw. *Statsordning*, Gr. *Staatsordnung*], *valtiojärjestys* [constitution, literally “order of state”, Sw *statsordning*, *författning* Gr. *Verfassung*], *valtion järjestysmuoto* [the regulated form of the state], *oikeusvaltio* [the rule of law, Ger. *Rechtsstaat*]. 5) The political use in the meaning of ‘polity’ and ‘political’ (to form a state; the adjective use in many expressions such as ‘political parties’ *valtiolliset puolueet* [stately parties], ‘political principles’ *valtiolliset periaatteet* [stately principles], ‘political democracy’ *valtiollinen kansanvalta*, [stately democracy] (literally stately power of the people), ‘political life’ *valtiollinen elämä* [stately life], ‘political issues’ *valtiolliset kysymykset* [stately issues], ‘political unity’ *valtiollinen eheys* [stately unity]).

Before the word *valtio* was created, the words most frequently used to refer to states in the meaning of international law (1) were *vallat* [powers] and *ulkovallat* [foreign powers] or *valtakunta*. [realm, Ger. *Reich*, Sw. *rik*]. In the economic area (2), the word *kruunu* [the crown] was used quite frequently prior to the existence of the word *valtio*. [Also very clearly as a subject in sentences – first metonymically of a king]. In the area of administration the words *hallitus* [government], *kruunu* [crown] or *valtakunta* [Ger. *Reich*, Sw. *rike*] were used earlier.

When one pays attention to the usage of the older expressions available (*valtakunta*, *valta*, *kruunu*), they clearly indicate that the need for the new word during the 1840’s was not felt in all of the later state-discourse areas, although it was very clearly felt in some. The older expression were used un-problematically in the areas of international law (1), in economic use (2) and in administration (3),

but not in the other two areas differentiated above, the juridical and the political. It may be concluded that it was precisely in the areas of juridical and genuinely political discourse that the need for a new word was originally felt. The word was created to express juridical forms of political life, as well as to describe the specifically political nature of activity.

This analysis alone is adequate to indicate a curious feature which persists as a factor that has shaped the Finnish language political culture for at least a century following this initial stage: there is an uncommon proximity between the elsewhere conceptually separated areas of ‘the political’ and ‘the state’.²⁸ The curious proximity appears most vividly in the two most common expressions in the first years of the use of *valtio*: *valtiopäivät* and the adjective form *valtiollinen*.

Valtiopäivät [Diet]

In the beginning of the history of *valtio*, through the 1840’s, 50’s and 60’s, *valtio* was most frequently used in the compound *valtiopäivät* [the diet session, literally state days] and in combinations based on it, such as *valtiopäivämies* [a representative, member of parliament, literally state-day-man]. *Valtiopäivät* established itself very rapidly and began to be used formally, for example, in the printed documents of the 1863 diet, when the Swedish documents referred to *Landtag*. *Valtiopäivät* and its combinations have retained their meaning from the times of the estate diet to their use in present day parliamentary language in which *valtiopäivät* refers to a session of the parliament (*eduskunta*).

Valtiopäivät is one separate word and its use need not necessarily be connected to any other usage of *valtio* or any particular concept of state. However, together with *Valtiosääntö* [constitution, literally rule or regulation of state] and *valtiomuoto* [constitution, literally form of state], as similar compounds connected with constitutional forms of political life, it joins the word *valtio* emphatically with legal forms of political life in well established formulations. In other languages, words such as “Parliament” and “constitution” do not have such a direct, positive and intimate connection to the “the state”. Together

with *valtiosääntö* and *valtiomuoto* [regime], *valtiopäivät* creates in Finnish an exceptional tie between the state and the parliament, and the state and the constitution. This is a feature that could and should be taken into consideration when analyzing Finnish political culture – is clearly related to the fact that there is no automatic oppositional position between the parliament and the state in Finland, as in those systems in which the parliament has evolved as a counterpart of the monarchy, and has retained some aspects of that oppositional position in respect to the state apparatus or government. The notorious “weak parliamentarism” in the Finnish political system is connected to this conceptual development.

Valtiollinen [“Stately”]

The most interesting form of *valtio* for the analysis of the Finnish political vocabulary is its adjective form, *valtiollinen*, has been used with extreme frequency since the beginning. The adjective *valtiollinen*, used more or less in the present meaning of political is a very local feature. *Valtiollinen* appears from early on in such combinations as “*valtiolliset pyrintöt*” [stately endeavors], “*valtiolliset tavoitteet*” [stately pursuits], “*valtiolliset harrastukset*” [stately occupations] etc., which are all indicative of a character of action.

Valtiollinen implies a concept of state that has very little to do with either the Skinnerian, Koselleckian or other “modern” concepts of state: it does not specifically involve a power that is detached from both the rulers and the ruled, and it does not involve an agent, the state as a grand persona. Indeed, it does not involve any concept of state as a power or agency. Instead, it does have a strong connection to the Snellmanian usage of *stat* as a characteristic of action. Although the Snellmanian concept of *sedlighet* and expressions such as *verksamheten i staten* [action within the state] did not remain as expressions of a special public character of orientation in the consequent political language, this aspect still seems to have been preserved in expressions such as *valtiollinen toiminta* [stately action], ‘stately occupations’ and ‘stately pursuits’, which all indicate the specifically political nature of action and which were, indeed, later re-

placed by the expressions *poliittinen toiminta* [political action], ‘political occupations’ and ‘political pursuits’, etc.

A shift from Snellmanian thought may well have occurred here through the fennomanian construction of the Finnish political language and the incorporation of the Snellmanian content of *stat* into the very word used in Finnish. While Snellman and other Swedish speakers, also made use of the Swedish adjective *politisk* [political], the word *poliittinen* [political] did not appear in Finnish until much later.²⁹ For more than a century *valtiollinen* remained characteristic of action, and was only replaced definitively by *poliittinen* [political] in the 1950s. One of the common phrases in the transition period was the compound *valtiollis-yhteiskunnallinen* [stately-societal], which then became merely *yhteiskunnallinen*³⁰ or *poliittinen*, and today *valtiollinen* is only rarely encountered in the meaning “political”.

The special connection of the word *valtio* to expressions of political action may also have given a characteristic flavor to Finnish political culture. If all that is political is immediately connected with the state, it should not be surprising that, as is well known, there has been a tendency to turn all political movements into state-committees within the polity. The concept of political interests that are separate from the interests of the state has remained a fairly foreign concept. This feature is related to “weak parliamentarism”, that is to very little structural opposition between the government, on the one hand and parliament and parties, on the other. Indeed, for a long time all the parties in parliament were, and sometimes still are, referred to as *valtiolliset puolueet* [stately parties], when the expression “political parties” might just as well be used.

Since *poliittinen* began its overtaking over the term *valtiollinen*, the use of the later has steadily declined. It is notable, however, that *valtiollinen* remains in use today, and my observation is that it is currently frequently applied in cases when a speaker wishes to “upgrade” his/her political message from a mere party dispute to the category of “above quarrel, generally agreeable, of great importance”. In this context, it is noticeable that the word has also regained some of the old European meanings of ‘the state’, in that the status-aspect appears in the foreground of its use. Also, at times the ritual and the festive is particularly connected to the use of *valtiollinen*. In the context of the recent presidential inauguration, for example, media com-

mentators repeatedly referred to the ceremony as a “*valtiollinen tapahtuma*” [stately event], and the historian Matti Klinge specifically referred in his commentary to the very ceremony itself as a “*valtioteko*” [state act].

To return to the starting point and to the historians who have been arguing over the significance of the Porvoo meeting for the Finnish state, it seems to me that the question of the status of the Finnish state within the Russian Empire was less crucial for the formation of the word *valtio* in Finnish than is suggested by some historians. The word-formation seems to have more to do with the formation of the polity, with the form of political life and with the expression of political action. For an analyst of political culture, the fact that politics so forcefully came to be verbally associated with the state might well be one of the most interesting features of Finnish political vocabulary. At the moment of its birth, the Finnish ‘state’ had an intense meaning as a polity, an autonomously organized political field, and was less intended to refer to an agent in the international field among other states, and this contributed to the specific conflation of ‘the state’ and ‘politics’. The vocabulary and usage that came to existence have lingered, and consequently ‘the state’ has continued to have a different area of use in Finnish in comparison to its use in many other political cultures.

Extracts of Documents

- (1) The 23.12.1808 circular letter of G.M. Sprengtporten after having been nominated as the general governor of Finland:

“Kauvan on Suomen-Maa ollut yxi riidan ja kunnia-ahneuden aine. Turvattomuus ja pelko yhden heikon Hallitus-Wallan alla on tupehduttanut monen viriän Maanviljelijän toimen, on estänyt usiamman kuin yhden niistä asianhaaroista, jotka maan paremmaksi ylösauttamiseksi olisit mahdolliset olleet, on johdattanut Maakunnan heikoon tilaan ja pojes poistanut elatuskeinoista heidän luonnollisen enääntymisen. Tainkaltainen tila, tämä turvattomuus on nyt lakannut, ja Jumalan edeskatzomus on vihdoin, meidän onnexamme niin päättynyt, että Suomen-Maan tulevainen vakuus ja menestys... Suomen-Maan parhaxi.”³¹

[Suomen-Maa [Suomi's Land] has long been an object of contention and greedy ambition. Insecurity and fear under a weak Government [literally Government-power] has frustrated many an industrious peasant's action, has obstructed more than one of those efforts that would have been possible to uplift the country, has led the province to a weak state and emptied the trades/professions/means of living of their natural increase. This kind of state, this insecurity, has now ended, and the Gods providence has at last, for our happiness so decided, that the future stability and success of Suomi-Land...for the best of Suomi-Land...]

- (2) The Emperor's oath at Porvoo 29.3.1809:

“Teemme tietäväksi: Että sitte kuin Me Sen Korkeimman edeskatzomisesta olemma ottaneet Suuren Ruhtinaan-maan Suomen hallituxemme ala, olemma Me tämän kautta tahtoneet wahwistaa ja kiinnittää Maasa olewan Christillisen Opin ja perustuslait niin myös niitä vapauxia ja oikeuxia, kuin kukin sääty nimetysä Suuresa Ruhtinan-maasa erinomattain, ja kaikki sen Asuwaitet yhteisesti, niin ylhäiset kuin alhaiset tähän sakka Constitutionin eli säättämisen jälkeen owat natineet: Lupaaamme myös pitää kaikkia niitä etuja ja asetuxia wahwana ja järkähtämättömänä heidän täydellisessä woimasansa...”³²

[We let it be known: that after we of the providence of the highest have taken the Grand-Duchy Suomi under our government, have we through this wished to strengthen and fasten the country's Christian doctrine and the constitutional laws and well as the freedoms and rights, such as each estate in this Grand Duchy separately and all its inhabitants in common, as well the noble as the humble up till now, following the constitution or a decree, have been enjoying. We also promise to keep all these privileges and decrees strong and immovable in their full power...]

- (3) In an appeal by the peasants of the Mikkeli region to annul the language regulations in 1854, Antti Manninen (1831-1866) wrote:

” ..., että Teidän Majesteettinne Armossa tahtois i säättää määrätyn ajan kuluttua Suomenkielen yleiseksi pääkieleksi Ruotsinkielen siaan, sekä opetuslaitoksessa että hallitus-asioissa, niissä maakunnissa, joissa meitä Suomalaisia asuu, jonka kautta Suomalainen kansa voittaisi monta sanomattoman suurta ja hyödyllistä etua.”³³

[...that your majesty in his mercy would will to decree after a certain period of time the Finnish language to be the common main language instead of the Swedish language, as well in institutions of tuition as in governmental issues, in those provinces where we Finns live, through which the Finnish folk would win many an immense and beneficial advantage]

Notes

- 1 Jussila (1987), (1989) 88-90, (1995) 65.
- 2 Matti Klinge, in his latest presentation of the 19th century Finnish History *Keisarin Suomi* [The Emperor's Finland] states "Convening of the diet in Porvoo and hailing Alexander I the Grand Duke of Finland on the 29th of March 1809 made Finland a special state, the Grand Duchy of Finland." Klinge (1997), 12. (translation mine).
- 3 Klinge writes: "Nation, expressed in French by the Emperor in his speech should be understood more than anything as a reference to political nation, a state, in the same meaning as it appears in the French 1789 expression *assemblée nationale*, "national assembly". (Translation mine) Klinge's point seems to be that the conception of the Finnish state being born at Porvoo is accurate because, in fact, at that point, Finland started to function as an separate polity.
- 4 Tommila (1984) 74.
- 5 "The History of Political Concepts in Finland" is the joint project bringing together a group of Finnish historians, political scientists and philosophers in order to publish an anthology on the history of key concepts of political life in Finnish. In this context a series of comparative seminars with similar projects in other countries has been arranged in the late 1990's. The project is funded by the Academy of Finland and led by Matti Hyvärinen.
- 6 Melvin Richter, *The History of Political and social Concepts. A Critical Introduction* (Oxford University Press. Oxford, 1995.). Richter includes in *Begriffsgeschichte* three large German projects: *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (GG), the *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, and the *Handbuch politisch-sozialer Grundbegriffe in Frankreich, 1680-1820*. See Ball, Farr and Hanson (eds.) *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*.
- 7 There is an abundance of literature on Snellman that repeats the clichés about the leading figure of fennomania, but there is surprisingly little original research on his thought.
- 8 Rapola 1960, 65.
- 9 Paavilainen 1983, 88-95. Paavilainen who studies the political language Finland in the 1850's bases her generalizations here partly on Rapola's earlier studies. For example Volmari Kilpinen writes in *Suometar*:. "Suomi on sentään eri maa, eri valle kuin Venäjä." [Finland is, after all, another country, another valles, than Russia.] and Rietrikki Polén in 1861 in Mehiläinen "Suomalaisilla on tässä Suuriruhtinaskunnassa yhtä suuret wallastolliset oikeudet kuin ruotsia puhuvillakin ...". [The Finns have in this Gand-Duchy as large wallastolliset rights as those who speak

Swedish...] “Rauhanliitto (1809) oli wallasto-oikeudellinen teko”. [The peace treaty (1809) was an act in the realm of wallasto-law.] The last formulation referring clearly to the German Staats-Recht, Swedish Stats Rätt.]

- 10 *Stat*: *Waltio* [the state]; *statsärende*: *waltiollinen* (l. *hallituksellinen asia*), [state {adj.}, (E.I. governmental affair)]; *statsändamål*: *waltiollinen l. hallituksellinen päätarkoitus* [state {adj.} E.I. governmental end; *statskunst*: *waltio-taito* [state-know-how, Ger. *Staatskunst*]; *statslära*: *waltio-oppi* [state doctrine, Ger. *Staatslehre*]; *statsvetenskap*: *waltio-tiede* [state science, Ger. *Staatswissenschaft*] and *statskunskap*: *waltio-tieto* [state knowledge, Ger. *Staatskunde*].
- 11 For example:
statsafsig: *walta-kunnallinen l. hallituksellinen tarkoitus*
statsangelägenhet: *walta-kunnallinen l. hallituksellinen l waltiollinen asia*
Statsborgare: *maa-kuntalainen*
Statsförfattning: *hallitus-muoto; (grundlag) perustus-laki*
Statsförvaltning: *walta-kunnan hallitus*
- 12 The order of presentation also privileges *valtio*. For example: *stat (rike)*:
waltio, wallasto, walta-kunta; till staten hörande: waltiollinen, wallastollinen, waltio-, waltion, wallaston
- 13 For example:.
Statsangelägenhet: *waltio-toimi, waltio-asia, waltiollinen asia l. toimi*
statsborgare: *waltiolainen, waltion-jäsen*
statsembete: *waltio- l. walta-wirka, waltiollinen wirka*
statsfånge: *waltio-wanki, waltarikos-wanki*
statsförbrytare: *waltio-rikollinen, walta-rikoksen tekijä*
statsförvaltning: *waltion-hoito l. -hallinto*
statshvälfning: *waltio-mulkkaus, wallan-kumous*
- 14 For example: Gellner (1983), pp.3-4.
- 15 These are: 2) translation of the Latin *respublica*, common course, common, community (1681 *Vinterstat*, a translation of (*respublica glacialis*), a text about Swedish tradition of winter fishing groups *fiskestaten* and 3) (vanished meaning) geography (“The Lapps do not know much about geography (*uti staterne sträcker sig kunskap inte långt*), they just know these specific regions close to their own.”)
- 16 Another interesting aspect would be to see how the usage of *stat* differs between Swedish spoken in Sweden and Swedish spoken in Finland - the political vocabularies of the “*rikssvenska*”, and “*finlandssvenska*” begin to divert some very soon after the separation of the political systems in 1809, but this is beyond the scope of this study.
- 17 The presentation on Snellman’s thought here is based on my previous work on the subject. Pulkkinen (1989), (1997 - 1999), (1999).

- 18 *Siveellisyys* is how *sedlighet* (*Sittlichkeit*) was translated into Finnish, and the present meaning does not have any political connotation. It refers to morality in sexual matters. For.ex. a *siveellisyysspoliisi* [*siveellisyyss-police*] raids prostitutes. The thinning down of the thick moral meaning of the notion of *siveellisyys* into a very limited usage within sexual domain would be an interesting topic of study of conceptual history in itself.
- 19 The concept of civil society did not survive in the Finnish realm of concepts in its Hegelian and Snellmanian as a counter concept of state and defined as a-political, merely law-following, type of action. Neither did it keep its Hegelian meaning referring to a system of necessity. Rather, today, civil society [*kansalaisyhteiskunta*] refers in Finnish as in many other languages to non-institutional political sphere in contrast to the state as institution.
- 20 It is clear that 'acting in the state' is reserved to men in Snellman's thought.
- 21 Snellman's concept *stat* has other dimensions, too, the state also is an abstract subject, a "grand persona" in a Koselleckian meaning. But in Snellmanian use this persona, as an abstract will, is primarily a consciousness, not an agent. Only individuals act, as Snellman often emphasizes. Snellman also uses the word *stat* in his texts in a more conventional meaning when referring, for example, to various constitutions as forms of state, or of the state as an institution.
- 22 The writers of the volume are A.E. Ahlqvist, D.E.D. Europaeus, P. Tikkanen and A. Wærelius.
- 23 This is in a printed story telling about kings and realms, in the same story *valtakunta* is used more frequently. "*Sillä lieene jo aika meidänki kerran käydä omaa valtioammeki taasen katsomassa, niin arvelivat kumpasetki veljet: Pengo myöntyi, kuningas antoi kummalleki rykmentin sotamiehiä, he läksivät.*" [It should be time for us to go and inspect our valtio too, pondered both brothers: Pengo accepted, the king gave both a regiment of solders, and they left...] SMTR1847-23-2
- 24 I *Itsekunki kansan edestys ja pysähdys on kolminainen: tiedollinen (intellektuell), ruumiillinen (materiell), valtiainen (administrativ)*. SMTR1847-2-1 [For each people's progress and stagnation consists of three components: intellectual (*intellektuell*), material (*materiell*), stately (*administrativ*).
II Rinnatusten ja yhteydessä kulkevat kansojen tiedolliset , ruumiilliset ja valtiolliset toimet ja niiden katsastaminen on yleisessä Historiassa luonnollisin , jos muka mielit täydellisesti päästä tuntemaan nykysen aikasi tilaa. [Side by side and together do the knowing, bodily, and stately activities of peoples move, so to examine them in general History is most natural way if you aspire to completely know the condition of the

present time. SMTR1847-2-1

III Kanava näytti jo ensikerran ilmautuessaan olevansa vapauden ja valon rakas ystävä ja sen seureeksi myös Suomenkin sekä kielellisen että valtiollisen edistymisen vahva puolustaja , ja koko aikansa on sitten näihin asti yhtä riivakkana ja vilkkaana pysynyt .[*Kanava* showed already at its first appearance that it was a dear friend of liberty and light and as a result also a strong defendant of Finlands both linguistic and stately progress, and the rest of its time it has remained just as striving and active.] SMTR1847-16-2

25 For exmple: Preussissa ovat yleiset Säädyt katsotut sopiviksi ja otetut Valtakunnan yhteisiä asioita valvomaan. SMTR1847-18-4 [In Prussia the general estates have been seen capable and given the position of governing the common affairs of the land.].

26 Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seurat olisivat myös tietien mieluiset tässä tekemään mitä varansa myöden antavat , ja armollinen Esivalta , jonka juur näinäkin päivinä ei ole’ nähty säästävän Maan yhteisiä varoja (Finska Statsmedel)[Finnish state funds] toimittaissa mitä Se katsoo tarpeelliseksi SMTR1847-17-3

27 My texts have included excerpts of *Suomen Kuvalehti*, *Helsingin Sanomat*, parliamentary documents and party manifestoes from various periods of time and various literary and academic work. I am grateful for the Conceptual history project: especially Eeva Aarnio, Matti Hyvärinen, Susanna Noki and Ismo Pohjantammi for crucial help in processing the textual material.

28 A thorough comparative analysis of the Swedish used in Finland and Finnish language would be an interesting task. Also a comparison between the Swedish used in Sweden and the Swedish used in Finland in this area is lacking. There is, however, no doubt of a clear difference in the early use between Swedish and Finnish in that the adjective *politisk* is in use in Swedish and that there is no adjective form derived from *stat* commonly in use for ‘political’ in Swedish as there is in Finnish.

29 According to Kari Palonen who has studied the concept of politics in Finland *poliittinen* was in use in the language of politicians and journalists from the 1920’s on, but only in the pejorative meaning of tactics and game. Only from the 1950’s on it started to take the position of *valtiollinen* in the academic and official language in description of political events and action. More precisely of this transition in Palonen 1999.

30 More precisely on *yhteiskunta* (society) in Pauli Kettunen 2000. Printed in this volume.

31 *Suomen historian dokumentteja*, pp. 12-13. (printed originally in Finnish)

32 Ibid. p. 14.

33 Ibid. p. 51-52. Compare also the Emperor's letter 24.4.1861 in which translation into Finnish one *valtio*-word, more or less in a meaning "administratively", appears in the middle of several expression of *Suomenmaa*, *maakunta* and *suuriruhtinaanmaa*:

"... tarpeelliseksi noudattamiseksi, ja että keskustelemukset valiomiiehille esiin tulevissa asioissa kaikin puolin täyttäisivät mitä niillä olemme tarkoittaneet, tahdomme.. että kaikkea, Suomenmaan hyväksi tulevata...

... ja alamaisuudessa lausua, miten ne, maakunnan tarpeille lähinnä vastaavalla tavalla, ...

Tällä olemme tarkoittaneet, mainittuin valiomiesten kautta siitä saada tarkan ja luotettavan tiedon, mitä oikeastansa tarvitaan suuriruhtinaanmaan edistymiseksi hengellisessä tointumisessa ja varallisesa nenestyksessä, sekä mitkä toimet, joko sittenkuin maakunnan säätyjä niistä on kuullustettu, taikka valtio-hoinnollisesti, voisivat edesauttaa tätä sydämellemme alati kallista tarkoitusta...

Aleksander

Ministeri-valta-Sihtööri, kreivi Armfelt" [Tammikuun valiokunnan pöytäkirjat, s. 6-8] , Suomen historian dokumentteja s. 104-105.

References

Source material

Word Archives

Rapola Database on the 19th Century Finnish. KKTK, Helsinki.
Svenska Akademiens Ordbok.

Dictionaries

Ahlman, Fred (1863): *Svenskt-Finskt Lexikon. Ruotsalais-Suomalainen sanakirja*. Helsingfors: SKS.
Europaeus, Daniel (1853): *Svensk-Finskt Handlexicon. Ruotsalais-Suomalainen sanakirja*. Helsingfors: FLS.
Ordboket över Svenska Språket (1989). Del 30: Spår-Stockna.Lund: Svenska Akademien.

Newspapers and Journals

Suometar 1847-1848

Suomen Kuvalehti, 1918-1970

Helsingin Sanomat 1999

Documents

Suomen historian dokumentteja. [Documents of Finnish History] (eds.) (1970)

Mikko Juva, Vilho Niitemaa, Päiviö Tommila. Helsinki: Otava.

Party Programmes

Corpus of Finnish Party Programmes, collected by Eeva Aarnio, Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of Jyväskylä.

Literature used as primary sources

Snellman, Johan Vilhelm (1991-1998): *Samlade arbeten I–XII*. Helsingfors: Statsrådets kansli.

Literature

Ball, Terence, Farr, James & Hanson, Russell L. (1989): *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gellner, Ernest (1983): *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hampsher-Monk, Iain, Tilmans, Karin and van Free, Frank (eds.) (1998): *History of Concepts: Comparative Perspective*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Jussila, Osmo (1987): *Maakunnasta valtioksi. Suomen valtion synty*. Helsinki: WSOY.

Jussila, Osmo (1989): “Finland from Province to State”. In Max Engman & David Kirby (eds.): *Finland. People, Nation, State*. London: Hurst & Company, pp. 85-101.

Jussila, Osmo (1995): “Finland under Russian Rule”. In Michael Branch, Janet M. Hartley and Antoni Maczak (eds.): *Finland and Poland in the Russian Empire. A Comparative Study*. London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies. University of London. pp. 61-73.

- Kettunen, Pauli (2000): *Yhteiskunta - 'Society' in Finnish*. In this volume, pp. 158-198.
- Klinge, Matti (1989): *Mikä mies Porthan oli?* Helsinki: SKS.
- Klinge, Matti (1990): *Let Us Be Finns. Essays on History*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Klinge, Matti (1993): *The Finnish Tradition. Essays on Structures and Identities in the North of Europe*. Helsinki: SHS.
- Klinge, Matti (1997): *Keisarin Suomi*. Espoo: Schildts.
- Klinge, Matti (1998): *A Brief History of Finland*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Koselleck, Reinhart, Gschnitzer, Fritz, Werner Karl Ferdinand ja Schönmann, Bernd: "Volk, Nation, Nationalismus, Masse". In Otto Brunner, Werner Conze and Reinhart Koselleck (eds.) (1992): *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*. Band 7. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, pp. 141-430.
- Koselleck, Reinhart (1990): "Staat und Souveränität" and "Staat im Zeitalter revolutionären Bewegung". In Brunner, Otto, Conze, Werner ja Koselleck Reinhart (eds.) *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*. Band 6. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1972-1992, pp. 1-4 and 25-64.
- Paavilainen, Marja (1983): *Suomenkielisen politiikan sanaston "esihistoria" ja synty 1800-luvun puolivälissä*. M.A. thesis in political science, University of Jyväskylä.
- Palonen, Kari (1999): "Politiikka - Politics". A paper presented at the conference History of Concepts - The Finnish Project in European Context in Tampere 15 -18 September 1999.
- Pulkkinen, Tuija: Commentaries of J.V. Snellman's manuscripts for university lectures in 1856-1863. In J.V. Snellman (1996-1997): *Samlade Arbete, Volumes VII - X*. Helsinki: Edita. Volume: VII, pp. 782-786, 797-799; VIII, pp. 767-772, 772-778, 785-787, 787-789, 792-795, 795-797; IX pp. 916-919, 921-923, 935-937; X pp. 900-902, 914-916, 921-922.
- Pulkkinen, Tuija (1989): *Valtio ja vapaus*. Helsinki: Tutkijaliitto.
- Pulkkinen, Tuija (1999): J.V. Snellman Hegelin Oikeusfilosofian tulkitsijana. [J.V. Snellman's Interpretation of Hegel's Philosophy of Right] *Politiikka* 1/1999, pp. 17-22.
- Richter, Melvin (1995): *The History of Political and Social Concepts. A Critical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skinner, Quentin (1989): "The State". In Terence Ball, James Farr ja Russell L. Hanson (eds.): *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 90-131.
- Tommila, Päiviö (1984): *Suomen autonomian synty 1808-1819*. Helsinki: Valtioneuvoston kanslia.