Henrik Stenius

THE FINNISH CITIZEN

How a Translation Emasculated the Concept[1]

In the Greek *polis* and Roman *res publica* the notion of 'citizen' was crucial in the rhetoric of civic virtues, encouraging men to commit themselves to the good cause of ruling the city or the republic together with the other citizens. Since those ancient times the European concept of 'citizen' has, accordingly, included an element of pro-active citizenship, although feudal structures and absolutist rule for long periods kept the idea of pro-active citizenship in a state of rather deep winter.

In the Mediaeval towns of Europe there emerged another alternative or complementary discourse of citizenship concerning the gradation of political and civic rights. There were *cives simpliciter* who took part in the decision making of the city; and there were *cives sequndum quid* who were judicially and socially dependent on another person, a patron, and who thus had no right to participate in the ruling of the town. The urban history of Europe exhibits in this regard a muddled and perplexed "pattern" with different sections of society fighting against each other about what sort of political and judicial rights should be reserved for different sections of the town's population. There is no need here to dissect this complicated history. It is enough to note that the concept of 'citizen' in the history of European towns was used to divide the inhabitants into separate categories each with judicial and political rights (or the lack of rights) of their own.

When the universalist concept of 'citizen', negating the distinction between *cives simpliciter* and *cives sequndum quid*, appeared as a alternative term for the concept, this no longer happened within the framework of the city state but in the context of the state. The French revolution constituted here a decisive watershed.

This same period constituted a decisive watershed in the history of Finland. The turmoil of Napoleonic Europe finally produced a Europe where Finland for the first time emerged as a political unit of its own. Until 1809 Finland had been an integral part of Sweden, but it was then incorporated, as a Grand Duchy, into the Russian empire. And only after the emergence of such a political unit was there any articulated desire to create a political discourse in the Finnish language.

In this article I will focus on the way that those who lived in this new political unit, the Finnish citizens, were conceptualised by the persons consolidating a distinct Finnish political culture. How was the European discourse on citizenship adapted? How were the specific historical experiences of the inhabitants living in Finland used in the conceptualisation of the concept? The method used in this article is to focus on a translation of just one key text from Swedish to Finnish. Before presenting the text and analysing the translation I will briefly discuss the language issue in Finland.

The Language Issue

In the 19th century, during the early stages of the formative period of a specific Finnish political culture, the language of the elite was Swedish, even though important sections of society, the elite also used French, Russian, Latin or German. The majority of the population (in the mid 19th century 87 %) spoke Finnish as their mother tongue.[2] As the political elite consolidated the autonomy of the Finnish Grand Duchy as the home of a specific Finnish nation, all the important political groups agreed on making Finnish an official language on a par with Swedish. There was a consensus that the Finnish language should be worked on and matured in order to render it usable in administration, education and the courts. However, the

timetable for the reforms caused heated debates and divided the politicians into antagonistic camps. Although, as a hierarchical order of society was regarded as the only possible state of affairs, the liberal party, which was very much conflated with the Swedish party, thought that the reforms required a time span of several generations. They were at the same time inclined to think that even in the future there would be areas of the elite culture where the Finnish language would prove too poor to be an efficient vehicle of communication.

From a comparative perspective the success of the Finnish language movement was remarkable. It appeared to be more victorious than anybody could have dreamt of when Finnish nationalist ideas were first presented during the first half of the 19th century. In the space of two generations, from the 1840s to the turn of the century, the Finnish language changed from being the language of the peasantry, into being a language used in higher administration, academia and the arts, thus turning into an effective tool for all sections and at all levels of society.

Two Different Manuals?

In this article this process will be illustrated by focusing on the translation from the Swedish into Finnish of the most prestigious law manual of the time, written by the most reputable expert on Finnish law, Johan Philip Palmén (1811-1896) and translated by the most esteemed Finnish linguist, Eljas Lönnrot (1802-1884). More precisely, I will limit myself to his translation of one single concept, the translation of the concept of 'citizen' in this manual.

Lönnrot is not usually thought of as a politician or a political philosopher. His importance has been of another kind. By compiling the *Kalevala* he succeeded in strengthening the nationalist sentiments of the Finns. Lönnrot became the most prestigious authority on questions regarding the consolidation of a written Finnish language. In this article I wish to show that Lönnrot, even though he was not regarded as a political thinker, had – as a linguistic authority – a decisive role in the way in which political and social reality was conceptualised in the Finnish political culture. He created his own

concept of 'citizen' and at the end of the article I shall comment on how his conceptualisation had an impact on the use of the concept in Finland.

Johan Philip Palmén was an industrious and reliable official, who during his long career in public service was entrusted with one important commission after another. As a profound and pragmatic university teacher he became an expert on every part of Finnish law even though he never paid much attention to the deeper problems of the philosophy of justice. In the early 1850s he wrote a manual on Finnish law for the Finnish cadet school, a manuscript that was circulated only as a lithographed copy. However, after the change of regime in 1855, with the move from the autocratic rule of Nicolas I to the more constitutional rule of Alexander II, he decided to publish it. The book, *Juridisk handbook för medborgelig bildning*, appeared in 1859. An English translation would be 'Legal manual for civil education', although 'education' is not, of course, a satisfactory translation of *bildning* (the equivalent of the German concept, *Bildung*). Four years later, in 1863, the book was published in Finnish *La´in-opillinen käsikirja Yhteiseksi sivistykseksi*. The word *medborgerlig* (civil) was translated as '*yhteinen*' (common).

If one wants to judge the spirit and direction of Palmén's manual it is worth noticing that the Russian as well as the Finnish command of the cadet school adopted a positive and appreciative stand towards the book. This did not however prevent the book from becoming a crucial integrating and socialising tool for a very broad layer of the Finnish public during the second half of the 19th century. The book became obligatory reading for generations of intellectuals during a reform period, when jurists dominated both the administration and intellectual circles in public debate. The book demonstrates the skills of an ideological equilibrist, writing explicitly about Finland's autonomy with a constitution, legislation and public economy of its own, in a way that satisfied not only the Russian rulers but also the nationalist political elite. This balancing act became possible because Palmén avoided talking about Finnish *politics*. The target was not the Finnish *homo politicus*. Palmén was a conservative Hegelian with a trust in the benevolent state. Only because of the existence of the State, the good shepherd, was it possible for the individual inhabitants of that state to attain the higher reaches of human life.[3]

In translating the book into Finnish Lönnrot showed remarkable creative thinking. From a conceptual history point of view he demonstrated a pronounced independence in his treatment of the Swedish original. The concept of 'citizen' is a case in point. Palmén uses the Swedish word *medborgare* 33 times, and Lönnrot uses a great deal of ingenuity in finding Finnish equivalents. He uses neologisms created by other philologists, he also creates one for himself and actually avoids the word by using different kinds of circumlocution. Before I go into the question of whether there is any logic in Lönnrot's dealing with the Swedish word for 'citizen', I need to make some general remarks about translations.

The Notion of Translation Culture

The neologisms were the products of a translation process, because the making of a modern political language in Finland was a continuous adjustment of Finnish experiences to European ways of using and defining central political concepts.

There is a difference between conceptualisation in major languages and minor languages. When analysing concepts in the major European languages it is defensible to regard the conceptualisation as an individual performance by a linguistic actor without contrasting the process with equivalent processes in other languages, because the major languages have a type of self-sufficiency that the minor languages lack. Hence in relation to the cultures of minor languages, an analysis of conceptualisation without reference to major languages leads unambiguously in a wrong direction. Only by contrasting conceptualisation in the major language and the conceptualisation in the minor language can we frame the relevant questions and, likewise, only through such a contrast can one find the relevant answers to these questions.

As a part of a translation process conceptual history in the Finnish case becomes an analysis of asymmetrical relations, where the giving and the taking lack reciprocity. As there are asymmetrical relations of different kinds, there are, consequently, different kinds of translation cultures.

Firstly, I want to say that as long as a specific culture does not live in complete isolation without any knowledge of other cultures it has to be regarded as a translation culture, because the experiences of other cultures have to be objectified and adjusted to the code system of one's own culture. However, if one wants to use the notion of 'translation culture' in a more analytical sense one has to distinguish between different elements in the process of translation. More precisely, one has to distinguish between two different reasons why translations are an inevitable part of our lives, that is, two reasons why the option of a completely universal discourse is inconceivable.

The first hindrance lies in the fact that key concepts derive their content in a context related to the intentions of the person who uses the concept. The relevant issue in this connection is whether creative thinkers fancy that the concept they use are universal and generally accepted, or whether they think that the idea of universal concepts is illusory. If one looks at history from the Renaissance to the time of the Enlightenment one can notice that the nominalist tradition that emphasised the importance of rhetoric weakened at the expense of scientists' belief in an "objective" language with "objectively" defined concepts.[4]

A person who believes that the concept she/he uses is universal argues in a different way from that of a person who doubts the possibility of developing an elaborate universal system of key concepts. From a positivist standpoint, the aim of argument is to converge on commonly accepted definitions of key concepts, an attitude that could eventually be rather aggressive by and by (cf. Diderot who thought that persons who invent neologisms should be imprisoned). The hermeneutic stand, on the other hand, acts on the assumption that we/I conceptualise the world in our/my own way, and that "the others" do it in their own way.[5] Convergence, if it happens, takes place in a third space, to use the term of Homi K. Bhabha.[6] If one looks at the Finnish concept of 'citizen' one might judge that the case of Finland is extreme. All those persons who were involved in creating a modern political vocabulary in Finland saw the Finnish concept of 'citizen' quire separate from any other. None of the Finnish neologisms that were suggested made any references either to European urban history or to the discourse on rights, that was connected to the common metaphoric field of the

concept of 'citizen'. One has to regard these linguistic solutions as a decisive effort by the debaters to create a Finnish political language based on peculiarly Finnish premises of its own.

The other hindrance to a universal discourse consists in the simple fact that the political debate in Europe took place in language areas having their own limitations, so far as the range of communication was concerned. The possibility of influencing a common political debate – and taking part in discursive struggles regarding key political concepts – was dependent on what language area one belonged to. Here one should be more precise. It made a big difference whether one lived *within* or *outside* the inner circle of the European debate. The existence of the *République des lettres* is a fundamental fact.[7] Those who participated in a political debate within it, regardless of the language they themselves spoke – French, German, Italian, English, Dutch or Latin – could see themselves taking part in a common "international" debate with common "European" concepts.

For those involved in political debate geographically and socially outside this inner circle, it was almost impossible to fancy that their own argumentation could have any impact on the debate within the literary Republic. I have tried to identify intellectuals living in the Nordic countries during the centuries before the 20th who could think of themselves as having some sort of influence on European political debate, and I have come to the conclusion that they cannot amount to more than nine: Saint Birgitta, René Descartes, Samuel Pufendorf, Emanuel Swedenborg, Hans C. Andersen, Fredrika Bremer, Henrik Ibsen, Georg Brandes and Edward Westermarck. One could add Søren Kirkegaard, because he undoubtedly had an impact on philosophical debate in European centres, although he hardly had such ambitions himself. I exclude here scientists such as Tycho Brahe, Carolus Linnaeus, Anders Celsius and Christian Øhrsted, as well as artists like Jenny Lind and Ole Bull, knowing that many persons around Europe thought of Jenny Lind as an incarnation of such concepts as purity, holy art, authentic nature or ethereal deity.

However, there were several different positions in the ouver regions. The situation in Sweden before 1809, when Finland was still an integral part of that country, illustrates such differences. The Swedish-speakers in Sweden had a translation culture of their own, while Finnish-speaking Sweden represented another type. Swedish-

speakers, who wanted to achieve a position as public debaters, had to situate themselves very close to the "universal" European debate, which meant adopting and colonising the European concepts including their metaphoric references.[8] Even though they had hardly any opportunity to play a role in the European debate "proper", they had still the great advantage of having a "complete" language in the sense that the semantics and syntaxes allowed them to think even theoretically advanced thoughts in their own language. Finnish-speaking persons, on the other hand, for a long time lacked such intellectual tools and such intellectual independence. The discussion of citizenship was an example of a discourse in which Finnish writers had to pre-think their thoughts in another language – usually Swedish – and then try to give the thoughts a Finnish voice. Such a lack of cultural sovereignty might be related to the kind of obstinate cultural independence that the founding fathers of the Finnish political culture demonstrated during a later period, situating the metaphoric field of the Finnish key concept at a decisive distance from the common metaphoric field of the debater in the "core" of Europe.

The Finnish language matured during the last decades of the 19th century in the sense that the codification of the main corpus of the vocabulary came to an end. Looking at the period before that, one has to distinguish two different periods with two different types of translation culture. Until the 1820s the Finnish political language lacked independence. There were no autonomous Finnish speaking media dealing with political and social issues by means of which the debaters could develop their thinking in Finnish. Finnish words for 'citizen' occurred occasionally, but each time more or less as spontaneous neologisms. There were word-for-word translations of the Swedish word *medborgare* (*kanssaporwari*) as well as neologisms referring to individuals who were living together as individuals in the same community (*kanssa-asuja*). And there were eclectic suggestions referring to subjects (*alamaiset*) who dwelt together (*kanssa-alamainen*).

From the 1820s onwards, those political leaders that set up the Finnish language movement, the Fennomanes, were at the same time philologists having a decisive impact on the codification of modern Finnish political language, focusing on key concepts and trying to agree a Finnish vocabulary with Finnish premises. The aim was to

create a European, modern language fit to take its place among other modern European languages. The asymmetrical relation was no longer total, because the translation took place from one or several independent languages into another independent and self-sufficient code system. The serious nominees for expressing the concept of 'citizen' were three: (1) *'kans(s)alainen'* which was the most common word and could be interpreted either as a "member of the people" from the noun '*kansa*' meaning *Volk* or people) or "a person with (us)" from the postposition '*kanssa*' meaning 'with' as an incomplete word-for-word translation of the Swedish *medborgare*, extending the urban terms *´borgare´/Bürger´* to include a general notion of belonging. As there were no codified rules for spelling with a single or double 's' both interpretations were possible, even though it is obvious that the Fennomane philologists themselves had in mind the idea of *Volk*/ people, which means that a word-for-word translation from Finnish to German, English, or Swedish would be *Völkler*, *peopler*, and *folkare* respectively. As there already exists a Spanish word '*poblador*', derived from the noun 'people', referring more generally to the quality of being an inhabitant (a person living in the neighbourhood, the city, the region or the nation), the word-for-word translation would only require a reloading of the word with greater legal and political content.

The two other neologisms were: (2) '*yhteiskuntalainen*' derived from the word '*yhteiskunta*' (society) and (3) '*kansajäsen*', which word-for-word means "member of the people". The latter is a neologism suggested by Lönnrot when the neologism 'kansalainen' had already become a dominating alternative. Why was Lönnrot unsatisfied with the word '*kansalainen*'?

The Dilemma of Lönnrot

Lönnrot might have thought that the Finnish culture could manage without a concept of 'citizen', like the Arabic culture, which lacks a word for 'citizen'. As we know, the Arabic language also lacks a word for the European concept of 'state'. We can learn from this comparison without suggesting that Lönnrot himself was aware of these Arabic peculiarities. The conclusion one has to draw is that these similarities

are just superficial and coincidental. Inclusion in the Arab world was of a religious kind, which meant that the European concept of justice, anchored in the notion of an autonomous state apparatus, had no place in traditional Arabic culture. Lönnrot, on the contrary, had, according to Fennomane thinking, a strong belief in the state. What Lönnrot wanted to do was to express a Fennomane variation of a common European inclusion logic based on the relation between people and state.

For Lönnrot it was obvious that without a state there could be no citizens. In parenthesis I could mention that this seems to have been obvious also in the case of the Finnish speaking minority in northern Sweden. They have a Finnish dialect of their own, (*meänkiel*), which lacks the notion of 'citizen'. They speak only of the 'subject' ('*alamainen*'), because they did not take part in the Finnish state/nation-building project.

According to my interpretation the concept of citizen was of crucial importance for Lönnrot. His conceptualisation is not as broad as the sweeping equivalent European terms. One can note here that the German *Bürger* was among those German words that until 1840s had taken on so many over-lapping meanings that it had become useless for exact description and accordingly was not in use in legal texts.[9] Lönnrot tried to find a more exact use for the word and concept of 'citizen'.

As mentioned before, Palmén used the word *medborgare* 33 times, whereas Lönnrot used the word 'kansalainen' just three times in his translation. The reason is, according to my interpretation, that Lönnrot wanted to refer to a specific judicial category, which I here call *"citizenship in a limited sense"*. He uses the notion of 'kansalainen' in the very few passages where Palmén talks about the inhabitants of Finland, the members of the state, as persons that in reality had the same legal rights and duties. In all the other cases, which I call here *"citizenship in a broad sense",* he elaborated alternative expressions.

Lönnrot was thus very much aware of the fact that according to the sociological and judicial realities of the time, individuals were not autonomous and not equal in their relation to the state authorities.

The universalist principle was the complete opposite of the system of privileges, which was the glue of the society of the time. If a universalist principle existed in that period of history, it could only

exist as an abstraction in the heads of individual intellectuals. There was a notion of general law (*allmän lag*), but it was concerned only with the regulation of the various rights and duties of different groups in society. Furthermore, the courts did not treat all subjects in the same way. The nobleman had in this respect his own privileges, such as the right to be sentenced by an equal (that is another nobleman) and the right to be heard only in the higher courts (*hovioikeus/ hovrätter*).

However, in Palmén's original text Lönnrot finds two passages where Palmén referred to a universalist context that makes it possible for him to use the notion of '*kansalainen*'. (The third place where the word occurs is in the glossary at the end of the book, where the entry *medborgare* has two Finnish translations, not just 'kansalainen' but also '*kansajäsen´* (member of the people).

In one of the passages Palmén defines – according to a *ius sanguinis* principle – what a Finnish citizen is: that is a person who, regardless of birthplace, is descended from Finnish parents, or who has a Finnish citizen as a step-father. The other passage is more surprising. Stating the duties of the governor-general Palmén explains that he has to acquire relevant information from "officials and other knowledgeable citizens". Here Lönnrot uses the concept of citizenship in a narrow sense. This should be interpreted as an ideological statement on Lönnrot's part in that it assumes that ordinary people also have valuable knowledge that a wise government should consider. In another passage, where Palmén talks about "the educated section of the citizenry" ("den bildade delen av medborgare"), Lönnrot avoids the notion of 'citizen' and chooses to talk about "all the educated in our land" ("kaikki oppineet meidän maassa"). The difference between these two passages is that in the latter case Palmén refers to a semi-corporate group and not to individuals regardless of which corporate body they are members.

In all the other places where Palmén uses the noun *medborgare* or the adjective *medborgerlig* Lönnrot elaborates a differentiated vocabulary, including a couple of neologisms. When Palmén talks about an abstract category of belonging to a society regardless of what kind of society, Lönnrot introduces the word '*kansajäsen*' ('member of the people'). In this abstract idea of belonging to a society, a general notion that different individuals are included on different

terms is incorporated in the concept and is why Lönnrot cannot use the 'concept' of citizen in the narrow sense. Similarly, when Palmén talks about the general law, Lönnrot does not use the notion of '*kansalainen*', but the notion of '*kansajäsen*'. The notion of '*kansajäsen*' is so general that it can be used also in connection with primitive societies that still have no state apparatus.

Social life is an elevated notion, connected to the notion of the 'people' and the notion of 'voluntary action'. When Palmén used the adjective *medborgerlig* (civil) referring to social life in general, including social interaction in all kinds of societies, Lönnrot, accordingly, used the adjective version of '*kansa*' (people), that is '*kansallinen*'. This creates problems for modern Finnish readers, because the word '*kansallinen*' was at the same time Lönnrot's neologism for the concept of 'national'. The way Lönnrot uses the word '*kansallinen*' shows that he packed into the notion two different elements: on the one hand "social life in general" and on the other hand "something that is national". And what kept these two elements together was the notion of voluntary action or, more precisely, the idea of a primordial force that a free people can make use of by focusing their social initiatives on important societal projects, which in one way or another help to strengthen the nation. Here he refers to sound social activity, at a safe distance from the sphere where the official decisions in administration and political life are made.

In contrast to these elevated concepts of social life, Lönnrot also, in one passage, translates *medborgare* as '*maanmies*' (man of the country), which does not confer on individuals equal obligations and opportunities to take part in a social, nation-building process. The word '*maanmies*' is a traditional word in old Finnish for 'compatriot'. He uses the word in a context where he speaks about traditional, patriarchal practices according to which masters had the obligation to judge and sign documents related to the civic virtues of their subordinates. By this Lönnrot succeeded in communicating a differentiated view of social belonging raising historical layers to the surface of contemporary rhetoric.

Lönnrot's conceptual framework could not, however, avoid ending up in a contradiction. This happens when Palmén lists the civil rights and civil duties. Civil rights should be, by definition, universal. Therefore Lönnrot accepts the notion of '*kansalais-oikeudet*', referring

to citizenship in the narrow sense. But the problem is that the rights that Palmén lists are not universal. Of course Lönnrot regards the contemporary social organisation with its corporations and estates as completely legitimate. Knowing that one of the main principles in Lönnrot's political thinking was the desirability of a convergence between classes in the sense that the upper and lower classes should learn to understand each other, it is rather easy to give a conservative interpretation of Lönnrot's view on the individual's inclusion in society. According to conservative thinking society should also in the future be an organism, in which the different sections of society had their own duties and rights. The fraternisation that Lönnrot had in mind was still a relationship between persons belonging to different corporations and estates. He was not fighting against privileges. The only privilege towards which he felt hostility was the priority given to of the Swedish language.

Lönnrot was thus comfortable with the fact that rights and duties were unequally shared in society. But in his keenness to make himself clear he elaborated a concept of citizenship that was universalist and not just quasi-universalist. If Lönnrot had compiled a list of civil rights he would not for example have included equality before the law.

One can add that the reason why Palmén used the notion of 'civil rights', even if that judicial term was a clear anomaly in the prevailing society of privilege, must be seen as an attempt to colonize the concept and avoid a situation where the concept became separately defined by potentially opposed forces in society.

Conclusions: The Meaning and Significance of Lönnrot's Conceptualisation

What Lönnrot did was to introduce a radically universalist concept of citizenship, which was quite a shift for a conservative mind. As a matter of fact such a deliberate move can only be explained by the self-sufficiency of the translation culture of the Finnish type.

His conceptual exercise drove him straight into heated debates on equality in contemporary European political discourse. As we know,

especially from the German debate, the year 1848 changed the political language, moving it away from the old revolutionary rhetoric of liberty and equality. Just as the Germans replaced the word *Bürger* with other figures of thought, so Lönnrot also found the Swedish word *medborgare* inexact. Like the Germans he wanted to formulate a real universalist concept of citizen, the 'citizen in a narrow, restricted sense' (*kansalainen*) that fitted into a discourse on *Gleichberechtigung*.[10] For those who had the political initiative, in Finland as well as in Germany, it became important to discover new rules and codes for a new class-based society, that worked without corporations and privileges but in which social and economic differences were still profound sociological facts.

There is a special kind of gradation in Lönnrot's citizen-words. When the reference concerns the ultimate aim of the state, the state as an educational-paideia project, corresponding to the Hegelian notion of *Sittlichkeit*, Lönnrot talks about 'a member of the state' (*valtiojäsen*). Palmén sometimes himself uses the Swedish equivalent expression, *medlem i staten* in contexts of the same elevated kind. 'Member of the a state' has thus a higher status than 'member of a people' (*kansajäsen*). In more trivial contexts Lönnrot just talks about 'inhabitants' (*asukkaat*).

But this type of gradation was very different from the traditional European discourse on citizenship. Here the discursive struggle had, since the Middle Ages, been focused on rivalry between different groups of (towns)people; between *cives simpliciter,* which refers to independent persons who take part in the decision making of the community, and *cives sequndum quid,* which refers to persons who are dependent on others, masters, and who therefore do not take part in the decision making.[11]

Lönnrot, for his part, does not single out and does not grade different types of *persons*. Lönnrot's words refer to different types of *characteristic* that can be ascribed to every Finnish subject/inhabitant. On a trivial level they all were inhabitants (*asukkaat*). The quality of being a social entity had a dignity of a higher order, which he expressed by using the term 'member of the people' (*kansajäsen*). Even more elevated was the quality of contributing to the nation-building process, which each Finn did as a "member of the state" (*valtiojäsen*).

The notion of '*kansalainen*', citizen in a narrow sense, referring to the quality of having equal rights and duties, had nothing to do with such a hierarchy. Depending on the perspective the equal rights and duties referred to, using Lönnrot's concept, could be either very limited or extremely wide. They were limited in the sense that the citizens had not the political existence of a decision-making republican. On the other hand, the rights and duties were wide, because they offered opportunities for each person, on a voluntary basis, to take part in the (educational) nation-building project as a 'member of the state' (*valtiojäsen*). It is in these opportunities that we find the reason why the Finnish citizen, regardless of his reserved character, accumulated her/his social and human capital, which is of considerable value when one looks upon this accumulation from a comparative point of view. But that is a topic for another article.

Moving from the question of the intentions of Lönnrot to the question of the significance and consequences of Lönnrot's conceptualisation, one has to come to the interesting conclusion that the great master of the codification project was not successful in this particular case. Lönnrot's attempt to introduce a radically egalitarian concept of citizen came almost to nothing (despite paving the way for the accumulation of social and human capital by all the citizens). In the following decades Fennomane politicians – by references to the *ius sanguinis* elements in the Finnish concept of citizen – could grade the citizens into 'more valuable' and 'less valuable' groups in Finnish society. Thus there were politicians making a distinction between the 'Finnish people proper' and the 'Swedish speaking population'. The concept of citizen became a diffuse concept of inclusion. By the end of the century even groups east of the Finnish border in parts of Russia that had never been part of Finland (or Sweden) came to be recognized as Finnish citizens simply because they spoke Finnish.

Notes

[1] This article is based on a smaller part of a more detailed and exhaustive article on the Finnish concept of citizen, which was published in 2003 in the Finnish anthology of Finnish key concepts: Matti Hyvärinen, Jussi

Kurunmäki, Kari Palonen, Tuija Pulkkinen and Henrik Stenius (eds.), *Käsitteet liikkeessä.* [Concepts in Motion] Tampere: Vastapaino.

[2] Having said that the elite spoke Swedish does not mean that the Swedish speaking population constituted the elite. The Swedish speaking population was divided into social groups in the same proportions as the Finnish speaking population. About the language issue see Kenneth D. McRae, *Conflict and Compromise in Multilingial Societies. Finland.* Rauma 1999; Henrik Stenius, "The Language Issue in Finland" in Clive Archer and Partti Joenniemi, *The Nordic Peace*. Ashgate 2003.

[3] E.G. Palmén, *Till hundraårsminnet af Johan Philp Palmén 1811 31/X 1911. II. Lefnadsteckning.* Helsingfors 1915.

[4] Walter Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London 1982), points to printing techniques as one reason for this change as printing practices paved the way to "the standardization of memory".

[5] 'We' refers to a more repetitive use of concepts, whereas 'I' can be regarded as the precondition for creative conceptualisation and argumentation.

[6] "The third space" in J Rutherford (ed.), *Identity, Community, Culture, Difference* (Lawrence & Wishart 1990).

[7] See for instance, Willem Frijhoff, "Conceptual History, Social History and Cultural History: the Test of 'Cosmopolitism' in Iain Hampsher-Monk, Karin Tilmans and Frank van Vree (eds.), *History of Concepts. Comparative Perspectives* (Amsterdam 1998).

[8] I a recent study by Peter Hallberg, *Ages of Liberty. Social Upheaval, History Writing, and the New Public Sphere in Sweden, 1740-1792*, 2003, the author analyses political argumentation contrasting on the one hand references to Sweden's own historical experiences (use of history) and on the other hand references to doctrinal discussions in France and England. The author concludes that in the political rhetoric of that time the use of Swedish history was more important.

[9] Willibald Steinmetz, "'Speaking is a Deed for You'. Words and Actions in the Revolution of 1848" in Dieter Dowe, Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, Dieter Langewiesche, and Jonathan Sperber (eds.), *Europe in 1848. Revolution and Reform* Berghahn Books. New York & Oxford 2001).

[10] Otto Dann, *Gleichheit und Gleichberechtigung. Das Gleichheitspostulat in der alteuropäischen Tradition und in Deutschland bis zum ausgehenden 19. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin 1980), pp.18-19, 95, and 211-213. Willibald Steinmetz, "'Speaking is a Deed for You'. Words and Actions in the Revolution of 1848" in Dieter Dowe, Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, Dieter Langewiesche, and Jonathan Sperber (eds.), *Europe in 1848. Revolution and Reform* Berghahn Books. New York & Oxford 2001).

[11] Reinhart Koselleck and Klaus Schreiner, "Einleitung: Von der alteuropäischen zur neuzeitlichen Bürgerschaft. Ihr politisch-sozialer Wandel im Medium von Begriffs-, Wirkungs- und Rezeptionsgeschichten" in Reinhardt Koselleck and Klaus Schreiner (eds.), *Bürgerschaft. Rezeption und Innovation der Begrifflichkeit von Hohen Mittelalter bis ins 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 1994), pp 11-42.