

Zenonas Norkus

Two Hundred Years of the Theory of Historiography in Lithuania, or How Joachim Lelewel Did Become the Pioneer of Modern Comparative History¹

Abstract. *In 1815 distinguished Polish historian Joachim Lelewel (1786–1861) published in Vilnius his Historyka, marking the origin of the theory of historiography in Lithuania and Poland. This paper, originally presented at the international conference at Vilnius university in November 2015 to celebrate 200-year anniversary of this event, explores the evolution and original features of Lelewel's views on writing history. Main focus is on the relation between his methodological and substantive work: did Lelewel's huge time and effort input into methodological reflection did pay off, endowing him with the competitive advantages in the "doing history"? The author argues that Lelewel's unconventional idea of the essential unity of history and statistics did help him to conceive his pioneering comparison of Poland and Spain in 16–18th centuries. Tabular form of presentation and implicit use of the multilateral multivariate comparisons can be attributed to Lelewel's dual institutional role of the professor of universal history and of statistics at Vilnius university in 1822–1824. Lelewel's unconventional conception of the relation between historical studies and statistics is another expression of this dualism. Another source of Lelewel's inspiration as comparativist is Plutarch's "Parallel Lives".*

Key words: *Joachim Lelewel, theory of historiography (historics), philosophy of history, comparative history, statistics, Plutarch.*

Pagrindiniai žodžiai: *Joachimas Lelewelis, istoriografijos teorija (istorika), istorijos filosofija, lyginamoji istorija, Plutarchas.*

1. Introduction

During its 436 years long history Vilnius university employed many famous scholars. Historian Joachim Lelewel (1786–1861) was one of them. He was not only one of the

most distinguished Polish historians in the 19th century, but also important public figure. He was intellectual and sometimes also the political leader of the radical left wing in the liberation movement for the restoration of

¹ This paper was presented at the international conference "Joachim Lelewel Readings: Past, Historian's Craft and Society in 19–21th centuries" at the Vilnius University at the 06.11.2015. I thank the participants for questions, criticisms, and comments.

the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (PLC) which was partitioned in 1772–1795 by the neighbour absolutist monarchies – Austria, Russia, and Prussia. The conservatives expected that restoration of PLC will be the outcome of the victory of Western powers over Russia in the coming war. Radical leftists hoped that insurrection in Poland will spark revolution in Russia which will destroy Tsarism and Russian state, providing opportunity to restore the PLC (Cygler 1969).

Biographers of Lelewel (Chodyncki 1929; Kieniewicz 1964; 1990; Koźmiński 1967; Krzemieniecki 1991; Śliwiński 1932 (1918); Więckowska 1980 et al.) are unanimous about his close relationship to Vilnius and to Vilnius university in particular. Lelewel was born in Warsaw, but was educated at the Vilnius university in 1804–1808, and started here in 1815 his academic career as lecturer in history. Rector of Vilnius university Jan Śniadecki, who preserved the influence in the personnel matters even after stepping down from Rector's office in 1815, disliked Lelewel and historians in general (Modelski 1929: 196–200; Šidlauskas 1986: 41–42). He did not receive permanent professor's appointment and taught only as a deputy professor. Therefore, in 1818 he left in Vilnius and went for two years to Warsaw university to work as librarian, but came back to Vilnius in 1821 to take the permanent position of the professor at last. Lelewel's lectures were immensely popular among the students. The popularity backfired: when Tsarist police

started investigation of the activities of the students' secret societies, Lelewel became one of principal suspects and culprits. In 1824 he was fired and banned to Warsaw. Here Lelewel was engaged in the historical studies as well as in political activities, and was elected a deputy to the *Sejm* of Congress Poland². During the 1830–1831 uprising, Lelewel served as member of Polish government. Therefore, he was forced to emigrate after its suppression, living since 1833 in Brussels.

Although Lelewel taught at Vilnius university only few years (in 1815–1818 and 1822–1824), he nostalgically remembered them as best time in his life (Lelewel 1957). His last will is the best testimony of his standing affection for Vilnius. Lelewel donated his library to Vilnius university, including the very valuable geographical atlas collection. However, his last will could be executed only after the restoration of Vilnius university. Since 1919, Vilnius and its region were annexed Poland, and the Vilnius university functioned in the 1919–1939 by the name of Stephan Báthory University. On the occasion of the 350th anniversary of the Vilnius University in 1929, Lelewel's remains were transferred from the Montmartre Cemetery in Paris to the Rasos Cemetery in Vilnius.

On the second floor of the Vilnius university library the visitors can see Joachim Lelewel's Hall. The library preserves Lelewel's archive together with his library. Some of his works were recently translated and published in Lithu-

² This was Kingdom of Poland, established in 1815 and connected to Russia by union. Congress Poland had very broad autonomy in the internal affairs, its own currency, and even the army, which was main insurgent military force during 1830–1831 uprising.

anian (Lelewel 2011). While living in Brussels, Lelewel befriended Karl Marx, who also lived here some time (1845–1847) as an emigrant. Lelewel's reputation of revolutionary and Marx's close acquaintance did help the memories of his life and work in Vilnius to survive under Soviet occupation. In 1986, the international conference to commemorate 200-years birth anniversary to took place (Lazutka 1987). In 1973, would-be diplomat and judge of the Constitutional Court Zenonas Namavičius defended the Candidate of Sciences (PhD) dissertation on Lelewel's legal and political philosophy and published as a book (Намавичюс 1991). Last event in this long tradition of the memorial events to honour Lelewel at Vilnius university took place in 2015. Young Lithuanian historians deeply interested in the methodology of historical studies Aurelijus Gieda and Aurimas Švedas organised international conference "Joachim Lelewel Readings: Past, Historian's Craft and Society in 19–21th centuries". The conference, which was co-sponsored by the Polish Institute in Vilnius and Research Council of Lithuania, worked on November 5–6th 2015 at the Vilnius university with the participants coming from Czech Republic, Lithuania, Netherlands, and Poland.³

The occasion and reason for this event was 200th anniversary of the publication of the Lelewel's *Historyka* here in Vilnius (Lelewel

1815; 1964 (1815)b). There is no commonly accepted translation of this word (*Historik* in German, *istorika* in Lithuanian; *Historyka* in Polish) into English, designating the theory or philosophy of historical studies. Although some authors are already using the word „historics“ (e.g. Vašiček 2009: 28), it is still not a common usage. Therefore, I will use the original Polish word *Historyka* along with longer or shorter circumlocutions like “theory of historiography”, “theory of historical studies”, “methodology of history”, “philosophy of historiography”, “philosophy of history”, “metahistory” et al. Although they all have common reference, there are fine differences in their sense (see Norkus 1996; Tucker 2009)

Actually, the year of the publication of Lelewel's *Historyka* is also the birthdate of the theory of historiography in Lithuania.⁴ My aim is to celebrate 200th anniversary of the origin of the theory of historical studies in Lithuania by discussing the questions about Lelewel's contribution to the theory of historiography, which did escape the attention the scholars, who have studied his heritage, or which remain insufficiently researched. Are there some distinctive or original features in his contribution to the theory of historiography in comparison with the similar work published at the same time? Did Lelewel's views in the theory of historiography evolve? What was the vector of this evolution?

³ The programme of the conference see at <https://www.if.vu.lt/dokumentai/renginiai/Lelewel-programa-2015-11-02.pdf>. 02.12.2015.

⁴ Halina Beresnevičiūtė-Nosalova (1997) has pointed this correctly out many years ago in her review of my own *Istorika* (Norkus 1996). Differently from Lelewel's *Historyka*, my book was only the historical survey of the theories of historiography, providing an introduction to the historics proper.

What is the relation between Lelewel's methodological and substantive work?

The last question may be interesting both to philosophers and to historians, because many historians believe (although not always say this loudly) that reading methodological works on the history is time wasting, which could be used more productively by doing what "real historians" must do: to work in archives. So did Lelewel's time and effort spent for reflecting and writing on how to research and to write history instead of just "doing history" (cp. Donnelly and Norton 2011) "pay off"? In other words: did this effort enabled him to achieve in the substantive research some things which his more "no nonsense" minded colleagues were not able to do, even if they were even more thrifty and assiduous in their archive research? Did the preoccupation with theory of history endowed Lelewel with competitive advantages over his more simple-minded and straightforward colleagues?

The very title of my paper gives the hint how I am answering the last question. But before that, I will provide the inventory of Lelewel's contributions to the theory of historical studies. Then I will proceed to answer the questions raised above.

2. Lelewel's Contributions to the Theory of Historical Studies

Lelewel's *Historyka*, which did appear on the book market in 1815 was a small book with no references, intended as teaching aid for his students. Although he did read this text as the inaugural lecture at Vilnius university in April 1815, late Lelewel had no high opinion about

his first publication in the theory historiography: "Historics, obscurely conceived and even more obscurely written, was printed in Vilnius in 1815. Since this time, it was reworked, and here I am presenting only its sketch and foundation" (Lelewel 1959 (1850): 111–112). However, there are two inter-related reasons for its commemorative celebration. Firstly, it was first publication of this kind in Polish, which at the beginning of the 19th century still was (along with the Latin) the language of the higher culture and education in the huge territory of the former PLC. After the uprisings in 1830–31 and 1863–64, Tsarist government limited and then suppressed university education in Polish. However, it did survive and flourish in the former PLC territories under the rule of Austria and Prussia.

Therefore, by the time of the restoration of the independence in 1918, Poland had historical scholarship meeting all international standards. One of the manifestations of the high level of Polish historical cultures was the uninterrupted tradition of the theory of historical studies. It was upheld and continued remembering Lelewel's pioneering contribution (see e.g. Handelsman 1928 (1921)); Moszczeńska 1977 (1968); Topolski 1984 (1968); Julkowska 1998 et al.). Polish methodologists of history remember Lelewel as its founding father, who did find the translation of the Latin (*ars historica*) and German (*Historik*) names of the theory of historiography, which did catch on in the Polish language (see Pajewski 1962). It is not an idle musing to surmise that without Lelewel's contribution Poland would not become one of the few world countries publishing a specialised

periodical on the theory of historical studies.⁵ There was no interruption in this tradition even during Communist period, which did witness in Poland original interpretations of Marxism. One of its products is the Poznan school in the philosophy of humanities and social sciences, still remaining internationally famous trademark of Polish philosophy (see e.g. Brzechczyn and Paprzycka 2012).

The fates of the theory of historical studies were much more difficult in Lithuania. After the closing of Vilnius university there were no higher schools until the grounding of the University of Lithuania in 1922 in Kaunas (renamed university of Vytautas Magnus in 1930). According to the meticulous investigation of Aurelijus Gieda of the origins of the professional historiography in Lithuanian language, gifted scholar and controversial politician Augustinas Voldemaras (1883–1942) was first to teach the course in the methodology of history at this university (Gieda 2013: 103–158). His work was continued by another Kaunas celebrity of interwar time Lev Karsavin (1882–1952), who published the translation into Lithuanian of his “Theory of History”, originally published in Russian (Karsavinas 1929 (1918)). Although Lelewel was remembered at the restored Vilnius university under all political regimes, the tradition of the methodology of history was nearly forgotten in Lithuania by 1990s. Lelewel’s contribution to this body of scholarship was only mentioned in

the works on the history of the historiography in Lithuania (e.g. Šidlauskas 1986). The first book attempting to revive the tradition of *Historyka* in the post-Soviet Lithuania was not the exception (Norkus 2015: 231).

Attempting to rectify this omission, I would like to point out that there is another and even more important reason to commemorate the publication of Lelewel’s *Historyka* in Vilnius 1815. Lelewel’s choice of *Historyka* as the subject for his inaugural lecture was no accident, and the content of this short book was not an improvisation. Nina Assorodobraj, who was commissioned by the editors of the Lelewel’s *Works (Dzieła)* to collect and publish his contributions to the methodology of history, provides most full record of the Lelewel’s contribution to the theory of historiography (Assorodobraj 1961). Lelewel’s extant texts in this area, including notices for lectures, published by N.Assorodobraj, make out out second volume (divided into two sub-volumes) of his *Dzieła (Works)*. This is about 1000 pages of printed text (Lelewel 1964).

According to N. Assorodobraj, Lelewel became interested in the theory of historiography during his student years. After publishing the *Historyka* in 1815, he continued to work on its problems for next ten years. This is the list of the Lelewel’s texts in the methodology of history compiled by N.Assorodobraj (1961: 986; see also Assorodobraj 1964: 43–44). Only part of them did survive and were published in the second volume of his *Works*:

⁵ *Historyka. Studia metodologiczne*. <<http://historyka.edu.pl/strona-glowna/>>. 02.12.2015. This is a yearly periodical that has been published in Kraków since 1967 by Cracow Branch of the Polish Academy of Science and the Department of History Jagiellonian University.

1. 1806–1807 student's essays (lost).
2. 1809 text sent to Kazimierz Kontrym and Tadeusz Czacki (lost).
3. 1812 text sent to Hugo Kołłątaj (lost).
4. 1815 *Historyka* manuscript (preserved; published in the vol. 2 of Lelewel's *Dziela*; see Lelewel 1964 (1815a)).
5. 1815 *Historyka* printed; see Lelewel 1815 (re-published in the vol. 2 of Lelewel's *Dziela*; see Lelewel 1964 (1815b)).
6. 1822 *Historia. Jej rozgałęzienie, na czym polega* [History. Its branches and foundations] (preserved; published in the vol. 2 of Lelewel's *Dziela*).
7. 1824. *Historia. Jej rozgałęzienie, na czym opiera* [History. Its branches and foundations] (preserved, published in the vol. 2 of Lelewel's *Dziela*).
8. 1823. Text on the combinatorial understanding of history (preserved, published in the vol. 2 of Lelewel's *Dziela*).
9. 1820 *Dzieje historii, jej badań i sztuki* [History of history, its research and art] (preserved, published in the vol. 2 of Lelewel's *Dziela*).
10. 1824 O statystyce [On statistics] (preserved, published in the vol. 2 of Lelewel's *Dziela*; see Lelewel 1964 (1824)).
11. 1826 *O historii, jej rozgałęzieniu i naukach z nią mających* [On history, its branches and connected sciences] printed; see Lelewel 1826 (re-published in the vol. 2 of Lelewel's *Dziela*; see Lelewel 1964 (1826)).
12. 1850 *Historyka z Wykładów historii powszechnej* [Historics from the lectures on universal history] printed (re-published in the vol. 2 of Lelewel's *Dziela*).

The most important texts in this list are the manuscript of the *Historyka* from 1815 (Nr. 4) and Lelewel's treatise "On History, its Branches and Connected Sciences" (1826) (Nr. 11). The manuscript *Historyka* of 1815 (Lelewel (1964 (1815)a) is much larger than its printed version (Lelewel (1964 (1815)b), which contains no references to Lelewel's sources. The manuscript version contains such references, allowing find out the works in the contemporary theory of historiography that Lelewel did know and read. The treatise from 1826 presents the mature and final version of Lelewel's views in the methodology of history. This is the corrected and improved text of the essay, which Lelewel submitted in 1820 as part of his application for the professor's position at Vilnius university. Obviously, the text published in 1826 reflects progress in the Lelewel's thinking about the study of history during his second period in Vilnius. There are no significant differences between this text and Lelewel's methodological reflections introducing the late lectures on universal history in 1850 (see Assorodobraj 1964: 45). Therefore, we can conclude that Lelewel 1826 contains final version of his views on the study of history.⁶

Somewhat puzzlingly, N. Assorodobraj does not discuss in more detail the question about

⁶ Actually, Lelewel played in 1826 with the idea to continue his work in the theory of history, and publish some time in the future new "big" *Historyka* (at least 10 printer's sheet size), but this idea never materialized. See Assorodobraj 1964, 35-37.

the relation between Lelewel's early and late *Historyka*, describing 12 texts listed above as 12 "Lelewel's historicis" ("*Historyki*" *Lelewela*). But obviously, differences between most of these texts are too small to speak about Lelewel's 12 different theories of historiography. There are many Lelewel's texts on the historical studies, but do they expose the same theory? Are there are some deeper changes in Lelewel's ideas about historiography over more than ten years of intensive thinking and teaching on this subject? What is overall direction of this change, if any? It is not difficult to understand, why earlier writers on Lelewel's *Historyka* did avoid this question. The printed text Lelewel (1964 (1815)b) is only synopsis or abridgment of more detailed text Lelewel (1964 (1815)a). With no access to last text, there was no possibility to reject the hypothesis that what Lelewel lectured to his students in 1815 did not differ much from what he wrote in 1826. The publication of the manuscript from 1815 (Lelewel (1964 (1815) a) permits us to know what he actually taught in 1815 and compare his views with the final version of his methodology of history from 1826. This is the task of next section, together with the tentative assessment of the originality of Lelewel's ideas.

3. Lelewel's Two *Historyka*'s and the Original Features of the Late *Historyka*

Perusing both short (printed) and extended (manuscript) versions of Lelewel's *Historyka* from 1815, a philosophically minded reader will surely remain disappointed. She will find here nothing like she is accustomed to associate

with "philosophy of history" after her bachelor studies in philosophy. It is barely possible to find the course outline in philosophy of history without Immanuel Kant's "Idea for a Universal History from a Cosmopolitan Point of View", Georg Hegel's "Lectures on the Philosophy of World History", or for that matter, 1st chapter of the "German Ideology" of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (see e.g. Baranova 2000). However, both *Historyka*'s do not contain any reflections about the shape and goal of world history or about its ultimate driving forces, presented in the said famous classical works on the philosophy of history.

Instead, Lelewel discusses how and where historians can find out historical facts (in historical sources, applying methods of text criticism), and establish causal relations between them, paying special attention for causal ("etiological") effects of their combinations. Besides that, he discusses the relations of history with other scholarly disciplines, which can be useful in achieving these objectives. The list of such "auxiliary disciplines" of history includes not only disciplines useful while dealing with old texts (palaeography, diplomatics, heraldry, chronology, numismatics and many others), but also those which help to establish causal relations by providing the knowledge of the conditions under which historical actors had to act (e.g. geography).

The texts of such kind were produced in significant quantities already in Renaissance times, while the early beginnings of the *Historyka* can be traced back to the Antiquity (see Norkus 1996: 11–18). However, in the 18th century important changes did take place both in the

content and intended message of this kind of literature. In the Renaissance time, history was understood as an art (*ars historica*), which was considered as special application of the more general art – that of rhetoric. In this mindset, historicism was conceived a literary genre useful for writers of historical books or their prominent readers, eager to find in them useful “lessons of history” how to rule or to how to meet with dignity the changes of fortune. Since the 18th century, history started to claim the status science or *Wissenschaft*⁷ in German (see Norkus 1996: 19–42).

Treatises on the study of history both reflected and effectuated this change, re-describing history as a science with specific methods and subject matter (see Blanke 1991; Blanke und Fleischer 1990). Importantly, most powerful foe, which was sceptical about this claim, at this time was the philosophy, which since the middle of the 18th century started to take live interest in the overall shape and driving forces of the world history. This “historical turn” in philosophy heralded the emergence of the philosophy of history, as a new sub-discipline of philosophy taught at the universities. Courses on *Historik* or *Historyka*, taught by historians, were intended to persuade students (which not necessarily were future professional historians) just starting to learn history, that historians are

better endowed than philosophers to claim to know human past “scientifically”. Because of this conflict over competences, historians used to be cool and sceptical about philosophy (and vice versa), with Lelewel providing no exceptions.

Lelewel had the luck to have among his teacher at the Vilnius university Gottfried Ernst Groddeck (1762–1825), one of the most distinguished classical philologists at this time (see Mężyński 1974). Groddeck was academically socialized at the Göttingen university, which in the 18th century was German top university, employing also many famous historians, collectively known as Göttingen historical school: Johann Christoph Gatterer (1727–1799; see also Gierl 2012), Arnold Hermann Ludwig Heeren (1760–1842), Christian Gottlob Heyne (1729–1812), August Ludwig von Schlözer (1735–1809), Ludwig Timotheus Spittler (1752–1810). G. Groddeck was Lelewel’s professor who introduced him into the flourishing German tradition of *Historik* (Šidlauskas 1986: 42). The role of Tomasz Hussarzewsky (1732–1807), who held the Chair of universal history at Vilnius university before it became vacant for many years after his retirement, is also probable. However, according to Algirdas Šidlauskas (1989: 114), T. Hussarzewsky knew and used in his teaching only older French

⁷ There are important differences between the meanings of English „science“ and German *Wissenschaft* (and its equivalents in continental languages, including Lithuanian and Polish) which express different ideas of science. However, in the first half of 19th century these differences still were not so deep as they became later under the impact of the positivist philosophy.

⁸ The author of the most authoritative Lelewel’s biography Artur Śliwiński (1932 (1918): 30-34) also considers G. Groddeck’s influence as more important in the formative years of the author of *Historyka*.

literature.⁸ Śliwiński, Artur. 1932 (1918). Meanwhile Lelewel's manuscript *Historyka* from 1815 (Lelewel 1964: 7–177) contain references mainly to German sources. They include Breyer 1805, Fabri 1808, Gatterer 1764 (1761), Schönemann 1799 et al.

Did Lelewel then only retell in Polish what he read in best German sources of his time (recommended to him by G. Groddeck)? In this case, the reason to celebrate the 200 year anniversary of Lelewel's *Historyka* scarcely would be no stronger (and no weaker) than our progeny will have in 2190–2195 to celebrate 200 year anniversary of the publication of the first Lithuanian (compilative) textbooks on marketing, strategic management, or microeconomics. These books do not contain any original ideas, and are significant only as the vehicles of the knowledge transfer from the West to the East. I will argue that Lelewel's reception of the German tradition of the *Historik* was creative, enriching it with new ideas. Even if these ideas did not find echo and did not make difference in the international scholar community (Lelewel paid the price for writing in Polish), they impregnated his substantive work, enabling him to become one of the pioneers in the modern comparative history.

I will leave for the further research, whether Lelewel's *Historyka* of 1815 contains any original ideas in comparison with his sources, and claim that this is indeed the case with its late and final version (Lelewel 1826; 1964 (1826)). There are so marked differences between both versions of Lelewel's *Historyka*, that their designation as *Historyka I* and *Historyka II* will

be only small exaggeration. Most importantly, Lelewel defines *Historyka* as the theory not only of the historical studies, but also as that of statistics (*statystyka*). In the earlier version, Lelewel described statistics as one of the many auxiliary disciplines of history, helping historian to account for technological, economic and political conditions of human action (see Lelewel 1964: 101). In the later version, he conceives statistics and historicis as two branches of the same body of knowledge, where *Historyka* has the task to account for sources and methods of them both (Lelewel 1964 (1826): 426, 456–457). In Lelewel's own words, conventional history is narrative history (*historia opowiadająca*), while statistics is descriptive history (*historia opisująca*) (Lelewel 1964 (1826): 424; see also Assorodobraj 1964: 37–38).

For contemporary reader with even superficial knowledge of statistics, these Lelewel's claims should appear not just original, but all-too-original if not wild. The reader should have similar feelings reading Lelewel's definition of statistics as “descriptive history”. So I owe the explanation, what was statistics in Lelewel's time, how it differs from contemporary statistics, and then to report what Lelewel had to do with the statistics of his time.

4. Lelewel and Statistics

There is no commonly accepted contemporary definition of statistics, and there was no such definition in Lelewel's times. Very approximately, contemporary statistics is toolbox of methods for study of mass phenomena, grounded in the mathematical theory of prob-

ability (Nalimov 1981: 225).⁹ In Lelewel's times, statistics in the broadest sense meant just descriptive empirical social knowledge on the actual state of society (Nalimov 1981: 208–211). The only obvious link between old and contemporary statistics is that both of them were about the figures presented in the tables and involved their comparison. However, even this can be asserted without any reservations only about one of the two traditions of old statistics, known as “political arithmetic” (see e.g. Donnelly 1998; Johannisson 1990; Porter 1988: 17–39; ΓTryxa 1945) Its founder as well as the inventor of this name was British scholar William Petty (1623–1687).

W. Petty became famous arguing that France is not the most powerful state in Europe despite its largest population and largest standing army. According to his argument, England and Netherlands are equal (if not stronger) due to their greater wealth and national income, which he calculated for the first time (Petty 1888). His work was continued by John Graunt (1620–1674), Gregory King (1648–1712), Charles Davenant (1656–1714), Patrick Calquhoun (1745–1820) (see Maddison 2007: 250–301). Contemporaries perceived as “political arithmetician” also Adam Smith (1723–1790), whom contemporary economists celebrate as the founding father of their discipline. The work of W. Petty prefigured the agenda of later “political arithmeticians”. The central problem was comparison of power of European states. For this aim, they collected all available quantitative

information about their area, population, armed forces, economy.

Second tradition emerged in the Germany (see Lindenfeld 1997). German scholars invented different designation for this area of research, calling its *Statistik*. They preferred this word because of its suggestive etymology: the root of the word “statistics” is etymologically related to Italian *stato*, German *Staat* as well as to English “state”. All these words express abstract concept of state, which did appear only in the modern time. The choice of this name expressed preference for the definition of statistics as *Staatenkunde* – the empirical knowledge of the states. According to Gottfried Achenwall (1719–1772), who used this word for the first time (in Achenwall 1749), the aim of *Statistik* is to describe and explain *staatliche Merkwürdigkeiten*. This locution caught on because it is very suggestive in German, although it is rather difficult to translate into English, meaning “important and interesting facts about states”. Importantly, the notions of German statisticians about the explanation of such facts were very different from the contemporary idea of scientific explanation, grounded in the Humean idea of causality as constant conjunction. They conceived causality along the Aristotelian lines, using the scheme of four causes as the framework to systematize “important and interesting facts about states”. According to the influential work of Hermann Conring (1606–1681), material cause of a state is its population and material wealth; formal

⁹ The author of this book presents very useful collection of the definitions of the “statistics” since the appearance of this word in the late 18th century to 1971. See Nalimov 1981: 207–226.

cause – legislation and form of government; final cause – wellbeing and happiness of population; efficient cause – its government (Conring 1694; Lindenfeld 1997: 20–21; Fasolt 2004).

In the 18th century, statistics was already firmly established discipline at German universities, with textbooks, handbooks, chairs and schools grounded by the most prominent professors. They engaged in the protracted and sometimes hot debates. These debates involved both special (e.g. what to include and what to exclude from the scope of the formal cause of state) and the fundamental questions of the “disciplinary identity” of statistics. In this context, the relation of statistics to other disciplines already taught at the universities were the bone of the contention. E.g.: what is the relation of statistics to political philosophy, tracing back its ancestry to Aristotle’s *Politics*? Or, how statistics is related to jurisprudence, including the constitutional law as one of its branches? What is its relation to political geography, which also provides the descriptive knowledge about states? Anton Friedrich Büsching (1724–1793) made himself famous, identifying statistics with political geography and disputing its right to exist as separate discipline (Büsching 1759).

One of the debated questions was relation between statistics and history. August Schlözer (1735–1809) from Göttingen university, who probably was most famous German historian of the 18th century, triggered this debate. In his influential work *Theorie der Statistik* he provided

following description of the relation between history and statistics: “history is an ongoing statistics; and statistics is a resting history” (Schlözer 1804: 86).¹⁰ This definition reflected A.Schlözer’s own combination of scholarly interests (see Peters 2003). After establishing his reputation as historian by laying foundations for the critical study of Russian history, he published books on a wide range of historical topics, including history of the GDL (Schlözer 1785). At the same time, he published broad read statistical periodical *Staats-Anzeigen*, which published reports of what happened during last year in the world. This was prototype of statistical yearbooks, published nowadays by national statistical offices and international organizations.

Importantly, A. Schlözer was not unique in this combination of teaching and researching in history and statistics. It was broadly practiced in the German universities of Enlightenment time. In 1803, Vilnius university was renovated after their example.¹¹ There was no History or Philological-Historical Faculty at the Imperial University of Vilna in 1803–1832. There were 4 departments (equivalents of contemporary faculties): Physics and mathematics, Medicine, Moral and political sciences, Arts and literature with total 32 chairs (full professor positions). Chairs of history were part not Arts and literature department, but of Moral and political sciences (see Jučas 1977: 12–15).

To quip (anachronistically), history was considered not as „humanity“, but as social

¹⁰ In German: *Geschichte ist eine fortlaufende Statistik; und Statistik ist eine stillstehende Geschichte.*

¹¹ They were not the only example, because Russian universities had no Philosophy faculty which was necessary part of the German universities.

science, because Moral and political sciences department can be considered as the ancestor of the contemporary faculties of Law and of Economics, educating future lawyers and bureaucrats. In Jesuit Vilnius academia professors of rhetoric taught history (Šidlauskas 1989: 54), while at the imperial Vilnius university history became coupled with statistics.¹² This was the symptom of the Enlightenment-style modernization of history. In fact, when the administration of Vilnius university decided to fill out the position of the full professor of history at the Moral and political sciences department in 1820, it announced the competition for teacher of universal history (*historia powszechna*) and general statistics (*statystyka ogólna*) (see Lelewel 1964: 911).

After winning this competition in 1821, Lelewel taught general statistics two academic years (in 1822–1822 and 1822–1823). Curriculums at the Moral and political sciences department included also statistics of Russian empire, which was taught by Ignacy Żegota Onacewicz (1780–1845), who was the only Lelewel's competitor. Lelewel had won, because he could show more persuasively than I. Onacewicz explain internal relation between history and statistics. To recall, his late *Historyka* (Lelewel 1826) is the elaboration of the essay, which he submitted as part of his application in 1820. Lelewel's methodological sophistication paid off in more ways (as I will show below), but this was most obvious case. The conversance

in historicism enabled Lelewel to write much more persuasive job application, providing him the competitive advantage over the less theoretically sophisticated I. Onacewicz (see Modelski 1929: 542–556). This is the benefit which the knowledge of philosophy and methodology can provide also for contemporary younger historians, facing much more fierce competition for academic positions than it was the case in Lelewel's times.

So "statistical" turn in the evolution of Lelewel's *Historyka* was related to his commitments as academic teacher during his second period at Vilnius university. Lelewel's idea of the *Historyka* as the theory of both history in conventional sense and of the statistics most probably was inspired by A. Schlözer. Importantly, although he accepted A. Schlözer's views about the essential unity or affinity between history and statistics, this was no simple rehearsal of the famous formulation of the German historian. Lelewel took the side of A. F. Büsching, asserting that statistics itself is not different from political geography (Lelewel 1964 (1826): 409–411, 447–450). According to final version of Lelewel's *Historyka*, constitutive principle of political geographical representation is unity of time. Political geography or statistics provides synchronically comparative description and explanation of *Merkwürdigkeiten* in many states or parts of one state at some specific time. Constitutive principle of conventional historical representation is unity of space.

¹² Ukrainian statistician and historian Mikhail Ptukha (1884–1961) provides well-researched history of statistics in Russia (Птуха 1955–1959). His exposition, including sections on Lelewel and Onacewicz, ends with 1863.

This is diachronically comparative description of *Merkwürdigkeiten* in some state or place during some period of time (Lelewel 1964 (1826): 424). Conventional (narrative or *opowiadająca*) history is chronology-based history or temporalized geography, while political geography in its turn can be defined as geography-based or spatialized and de-temporalized history.

The identification of statistics with political geography, considered as twin sister of history, imprints on Lelewel's late *Historyka* the mark of true originality. I am not able to point another one methodologist or philosopher of history, who would emphasize in such a resolute way the essential affinity between political (or, more generally, social) geography and history, implying also essential unity of their methods. This view has very interesting (and disquieting) philosophical-historical implication: history in its deepest substance is changing political geography. History will end in the moment when there will be no more changes in state borders and number. After this moment, there will be only statistical, and no historical change on the Earth. Have we already arrived at this Lelewelian end of history, where all change in political geography has stopped? Borders of states are still changing (no matter, whether these changes are internationally recognized), existing states are disappearing from world map and new ones are emerging or re-emerging. So against the solemn proclamations of the prophets of post-modernity like Francis Fukuyama, no (Lelewelian) end of history is

in sight.

5. Lelewel as the Pioneer of Comparative History: Plutarchean Connection

I can proceed now to my next question: did and (how) Lelewel's pre-occupation with the methodology "paid off" also in his substantive research? How his late view about essential unity of the political geography and history did influence his substantive work? I would like to recall that the main area of research of Lelewel in the emigration was historical geography and cartography (Lelewel 1852–1857; 1858). By the end of his life, he earned European-wide fame of the leading expert in this area. "Lelewelian equation" *Statistics=Political Geography=Standing/Arrested History* most probably was driving force behind the fascination of later Lelewel with historical maps, which he called by the Polish word of his own invention (*krajobraz*).¹³ What else does historical map provide if not a picture of standing or arrested history?

Although Lelewel liked maps, which are quintessential part in the geography works, he disliked numbers, which are vital element in the statistics (both old and contemporary). Lelewel disliked most strongly the statistics busy to find quantitative measures of the power of modern states. Lelewel called such states with disdain "statistical machines" (*machina statystyczna*) (Lelewel 2006 (1831): 44; see also 1964 (1824): 346–347; 1964 (1826): 408–409; Assorodobraj 1964: 65). Seemingly, he proceeded from the anti-positivist (or romantic) assumption that most important (essential) facts about history

¹³ In the verbatim translation, „pictures of land“.

cannot be measured and described by numbers. What are sources of this romantic streak in the Lelewel's thinking which *grosso modo* represents Enlightenment tradition?

Most probably, Lelewel's animus against numbers and comparative measurement of (modern) state power arose from feeling that struggle for restoration of independent Poland would seem an irrational undertaking from the political arithmetical or statistical point of view. Numbers allegedly allowing to measure and compare the power of states would make to seem it hopeless. Insurgent Poland would be no match not only against Prussia, Austria, and Russia together, but also against only one of them. Lelewel lived only two years too short to observe this cruel fact once more during the Polish uprising in 1863–1864. Contemporary author, writing about one of the founding fathers of statistics, makes following remark: "most accounts about Petty's conceptual contribution, miss what is historically instructive about him: his use of accounting for the explicit purpose of exploitation and oppression" (Philipsen 2015: 25). Lelewel could have the same feeling about the much of the statistics of his time". Because of the anti-quantitative or anti-statistical *ressentiment*, Lelewel is not a late representative of Enlightenment (despite the decisive impact of Göttingen school on his academic socialization), but rather transitory or in-between intellectual figure between Enlightenment and Romanticism, which was represented in the Polish culture during the first half of 19th century in the most impressively by Adam Mickiewicz.

I will argue that although Lelewel disliked

quantitative statistics, his knowledge of the contemporary statistics together with the innovative view of the relation between history and statistics enabled him to become a pioneer of modern comparative history in Polish historiography, if not in the all Europe. To repeat, there cannot be non-quantitative statistics according to the idea of statistics prevailing in our time. However, for Lelewel himself, "good statistics" was political geography with maps (not figures) as its dominant component. What about the comparative history?

Stanford University professor George M. Fredrickson provides authoritative definition, which is best starting point for the discussion. According to American historian, comparative history in the full sense is "a relatively small but significant body of scholarship that has as its main objective the systematic comparison of some process or institution in two or more societies that are not usually conjoined within one of the traditional geographical areas of historical specialization" (Fredrickson 1997: 23–24). The A. Fredrickson's own work on the history of racism and race relations in U.S. and South Africa provides an example of such comparative history in the full or strict sense.

From comparative history in the full sense, A. Frederickson distinguishes comparative history in the broadest sense. To qualify as such, it is sufficient to apply "comparative method" or "comparative perspective" casually in the study of some phenomena in a single society or state. It is rather difficult to find lengthy historical works, whose authors would not use comparative perspective or method in this way. Between the comparative history in the broadest sense

and the comparative history in the full or strict sense, he locates comparative history in the intermediate sense. It is represented by the works, where “the main concern is placing some local phenomenon in a broader geographical context, revealing the general trends prevailing in a given region or throughout the world, tracing some idea or influence across national or cultural boundaries, or describing a particular case in terms that may lend themselves to comparison” (Fredrickson 1997: 23–24).

Comparative history is indispensable for social researchers to generate and test theories and generalizations, which can be useful to enhance the understanding of the institutions, processes, or social situations other than those, which were directly examined while generating these theories. Historians are using comparative history to illuminate not only general, but also special features of the cases compared, so that each of them look different in the light of the others. Therefore, they usually keep the number of cases compared small, while social researchers prefer larger populations of the cases: even at the cost of the depth versus breadth dilemma which unavoidably arises including into the scope of comparison new cases.

Scholars in Lelewel studies are unanimous about his passion for historical comparisons. The authoritative statement by Marian Henryk Serejski may stand for this consensus: “Lelewel used comparison in his work extremely frequently. We can safely say that he did this with true passion (*z prawdziwą pasją*). He attached to the parallelizing the cognitive as well as the

didactic significance. He applied it broadly, comparing various historical phenomena: events, personalities, institutions, nations, cultures, historical processes etc. In this respect, he was unique case in the Polish historical literature, and maybe also in the universal one (*należał do unikatów w polskim piśmiennictwie historycznym, a chyba i powszechnym*)” (Serejski 1958: 369).

It is difficult to find among great historians of 19th century those whose work does not contain pieces of comparative history in the broadest (A. Fredrickson’s) sense. Few of them did not contribute to comparative history in the intermediate sense. However, only in Lelewel’s heritage we find work which fully corresponds to A. Fredrickson’s definition of comparative history in the full or strict sense. This is his famous *Historyczna paralela Hiszpanii z Polską w XVI, XVII, XVIII wieku* (Historical Parallel of Spain with Poland in 16th, 17th, 18th century). Lelewel wrote it under impression of the outbreak of the revolution 1820–1823 in Spain, and presented at the meeting of the “Warsaw Society of the Friends of Science” in 1825. It was printed for the first time in 1831 in the insurrected Warsaw. Already in the 19th century it was translated into French, German, and Russian languages. Some ten years ago, one of the most distinguished contemporary Polish historians Jan Kieniewicz¹⁴, who many years also served as Poland’s ambassador in Spain, published new edition of this work (Lelewel 2006 (1831)). In this edition J. Kieniewicz did publish for the first time the continuation of

¹⁴ His area of research is history of Spain and of the Polish-Spanish relations.

the text “Continuations. Spaniards and Poles Attempt to Resurrect”.¹⁵ The original manuscript of this fragment (in French) is preserved in the Vilnius University Library Department of Rare Printings.¹⁶ Lelewel did write this text 1836 or 1837, continuing the comparison into early 1830s, while original version ended in 1795 (partition of Poland) and 1808 (French invasion of Spain).

In his introduction “Why to read Lelewel?” to this publication (Kieniewicz 2006) J. Kieniewicz answers in detail the question posed in the title of said introduction. For the conference in Vilnius, he presented the paper, discussing the possibility of the continuation of Lelewel’s parallel in our time (Kieniewicz 2015). As a matter of fact, such continuations were already attempted in the late Communist and early post-communist time, when various authors did compare Franco’s dictatorship in Spain and Communism in Poland (Kieniewicz 1990; 2001; 2008: 175–191; Przeworski 1990; Linz and Stepan 1996). These authors looked for the inspiration and lessons for the Poland’s exit from Communism in the successful transition to democracy after the Franco’s death, which culminated in the Spain’s accession to European Union in the 1986. Differently from Lelewel, they compared Poland not only with Spain, but also with other Southern Europe and Latin America countries. In even more broader research context, Lelewel’s work can be considered as the starting point of the rich Polish research tradition (Witold Kula, Marian Małowist, Jerzy

Topolski et al.) on the causes of the development gap between the Eastern and Western parts of Europe (see Sosnowska 2004). Many authors from this tradition consciously or unconsciously followed in Lelewel’s steps, using countries of Southern Europe and Latin America as crucial test cases for their explanations (see also Szlajfer 1990; 2013).

Because of the limitations of the space, I will not retell Lelewel, but will concentrate on the features of this work, which are relevant for my topic: did Lelewel’s theoretical ideas about the relations between history and statistics, exposed in his late or mature *Historyka*, had impact on his substantive work? The gist of my argument is that without Lelewel’s theoretical ideas and conversance in the statistics of his time, he most probably would not have produced his outstanding pioneering work in comparative history, described by J. Kieniewicz (2006: 7) as “wonderful, disturbing” (*dziwna, niepokojąca*) book. I will start from the exploration of the putative sources of inspiration of this pioneering work.

First of all and most obviously, Lelewel was inspired by Plutarch’s famous “Parallel Lives” (Plutarch: 1914–1926). Although Lelewel does not refer to Plutarch by name, he starts his text recalling the ancient genre of “parallel biographies” and explaining, why ancient authors did not compare histories of countries (Lelewel 2006 (1831): 19). It is possible to speak about the classical comparativist tradition with dyadic comparison (N=2) as its distinguishing mark. Famous Russian philologist Sergei Averintsev

¹⁵ “Continuation. Les Espagnols et les Polonais cherchent a se relever”; “Kontynuacja. Hiszpanie i Polacy próbują się podźwignąć”.

¹⁶ Lelewel f. 77-79.

(1937–2004) provided (in Аверинцев 1973) authoritative analysis of this type of comparison. Plutarch's „Parallel Lives” are its *locus classicus* (see also Stadter 1992).

According to S. Averintsev, the rise of the classical comparative studies was related to the agonistic relations between Greek and Roman cultures. Before 2nd century BC Greek culture was grounded in the antithesis of Greeks (civilized people) and non-Greek (Barbarians). The subjugation of Greece to Macedonia in the 3^d century did not change situation, because Macedonians were hellenised. With Romans situation was different, because most Romans did not consider themselves as inferior to Greeks and did not helenise. Plutarch's famous “Parallel Lives” is just most famous piece of larger body of antique literature discussing comparative merits of Greek and Roman religion, literature and politics.

The purpose of Plutarch's comparisons is to demonstrate to Greeks that Romans are not Barbarians, and persuade Romans that Greeks are no lesser warriors than Romans (to recall, most of Plutarch's heroes are famous Roman and Greek soldiers). Some of the biographies, such as those of Philip II of Macedon and Scipio Africanus, no longer exist. Surviving texts include 21 dyad and 1 dyad of pairs (The Gracchus brothers Tiberius and Gaius versus Agis and Cleomenes). Many of the remaining biographies are truncated, contain lacunae or have been tampered with by later writers. Currently, only nineteen of the parallel biographies end with a comparison while possibly they all did originally. Plutarch's general procedure was to write the life of a prominent Greek, then to

present a suitable Roman parallel, and end with a brief comparison (*Syncrisis*) of the Greek and Roman lives. Comparison focuses on historical role, moral character (virtues), fateful turns in the life course – bad or good luck (*Tyche*; Latin equivalent: *Fortuna*), and how moral character manifests in such fateful situations.

In the 18th century, the reading of Plutarch's “Parallels Lives” still was obligatory part of higher education. One of Lelewel's teachers at the Vilnius university was Neriusz Golański (1753–1824), who translated part of Plutarch's parallel biographies into Polish. They were published in Vilnius just at the time of Lelewel's study (Plutarchos 1801–1805). Interestingly, Lelewel's own practices of teaching history included “emulations of Plutarch”. His assignments of topic for examination papers (*rozpraw egzaminacyjnych*) in the universal history from the year 1823 included following comparisons: „Comparison of Bolesław I the Brave with Clovis I” (for Eustachy Januszkiewicz); „Comparison of Bolesław I the Brave with Bolesław III Wrymouth” (for Kajetan Adamowicz); „Comparison of Louis XIV with Sigismund II August” (for Ignacy Klukowski); „Comparison of Hannibal with Napoleon” (for Zabiello); “Comparison of Bolesław the Great with Bolesław III” (for Jan Kruszewski); „The Rule of Sigismunds and their Comparison (for Edward Smiechowski)” (see Lelewel 1959 (1823): 689–694).

Most probably, there was nothing exceptional in Lelewel's teaching methods around 1823. The assignments of such type helped students to memorize or better understand the stuff they had to learn. They could be also be considered

as the useful means to educate a student as a “virtuous” person. We should not forget that Lelewel worked at the time when old classical idea of education (*paideia*, *Bildung*) was still alive. The new positivist idea of knowledge as mere instrument of power was advancing, but not victorious yet. So a history professor still was expected not only teach students something useful for their profession, but also to shape them as persons by presenting inspiring examples to follow. Reading Plutarch was considered as one of the best means. So still thinks the living classic of Lithuanian philosophy Arvydas Šliogeris in our days (Bartninkas 2009). Tellingly, except for comparison of Antonius and Demetrius, all Plutarch’s heroes are “positive”.

However, if Plutarch would be the only source of inspiration for comparative imagination, then we most probably would not have his pioneering “Historical Parallel of Spain with Poland”. We could only expect comparative biographies. To wit, writing comparative biographies of Russian and Polish monarchs, statesmen or men of letters would be prudent choice for Lelewel’s early self-advancement. Publishing such “Parallel Lives”, he could succeed to get permanent professor’s position already in 1816 and 1817. To recall, he was employed at the Vilnius university only as deputy professor, because the near all-powerful at this time Rector Jan Śniadecki disliked him and history and general. Lelewel’s biographers disagree about the

J. Śniadecki’s real attitude to Lelewel, but agree that young historian himself perceived J. Śniadecki as main hindrance for his advancement (see Modelski 1929: 196–200, 547; Śliwiński 1932 (1918): 60–63, 69).¹⁷

According to Daniel Beauvois magisterial book (Beauvois 2010), the parallel between the role of Greeks in Roman empire and that of Poles in Russian empire helped for many Polish aristocrats and men of letters to come to terms with their own civic conscience, legitimating their service to Russian tsars (between 1795–1830 at the very least). This is also how J. Śniadecki did rationalise his double loyalty – to Polish (=Greek) culture and Russian(=Roman) state (see Beauvois 2010: 145). So parallel biographies of Polish and Russian famous historical persons, intimating to Polish and Russian readers that (not all) Russians were Barbarians, and recalling that Poles were no lesser warriors could indeed find good market around 1815.

6. Lelewel as Pioneer of Comparative History: Statistical Connection

I will argue in this section that the parallel of Spain with Poland is not only didactical or expository device serving the educational purpose in the way Plutarch’s “Parallel Lives” and their many imitations did. Differently from classical Plutarchean comparisons, his texts contain outline of the argument, which serves to refute or prove causal statements. In

¹⁷ Actually, final decisions about the employment of new professors made the then curator of Vilnius university Adam Jerzy Czartoryski. He had misgivings about Lelewel because of his reluctance to go abroad (at the university’s cost) for the study tour (to Göttingen or Paris). In the very “progressive” way, he considered such study tour as obligatory qualification condition for native candidates to full professor’s positions. See Modelski 1929: 182, 508-509, 561.

other words, there is in Lelewel's text implicit (albeit it is not completely elaborated and not free from flaws) logical structure, which serves to create added value: new knowledge about the histories of these two countries compared. This is something, which we would not be able to know after reading the same historical facts reported as parts of two separate conventional narratives – one about Spain's history in the 16–18 centuries, and another on Poland's history during same period. The presence of this structure makes Lelewel's "Historical parallel" different from Plutarch's "Parallel Lives", where no causal hypotheses are tested. It makes Lelewel not just another Plutarch's imitator, but true innovator and the pioneer of modern comparative history. These innovative features can be explained in their turn by Lelewel's double identity of historian and statistician, as reflected in his late *Historyka*.

Firstly, Lelewel's "Historical Parallel" can be read as refutation of the influential argument that republican constitution of Poland was the cause of the decline and fall of this country by the end of 18th century. According to Lelewel's presentation, Spain already in 16th century became absolutist, while *szlachta* democracy did establish in Poland at the same time. Republicanism and democracy is not the culprit for Poland's decline and fall, because absolutism did not save Spain from the same fate. Such interpretation can be corroborated by the Lelewel's answer to the questionnaire of

the famous French historian François Guizot, written in 1830s: "in general, there is a belief that the election of the king was the main cause of the decline of Poland. But did the election of the stathouder, the Pope, the Doge, the consul, the archont entail the decline and fall of these states? Has not the hereditary succession led to the decline of Spain?" (Lelewel 1962: 23). The self-reference to "Historical Parallel" follows then a few lines below.

Secondly, Lelewel's "Historical Parallel" can be read as an argument that near total control of Catholic Church (or more specifically: that of Jesuit Order) over cultural life was main cause of the decline and fall of both arch-Catholic European nations. According to this argument, the grip of Jesuits led to cultural and technological stagnation of both countries, allowing Protestant, Gallican Catholic (France) and even Orthodox (Russia) neighbours to forge ahead and accumulate technological and military advantages, which made formerly great powers Spain and Poland to helpless and hapless victims and manipulation objects by their much more stronger rivals. For example, this is how Karol Koźmiński did interpret the message of the Lelewel's "Historical Parallel": "the author did find essential similarity between the courses of history of Spain and Poland, and not only in the convergence in the conduct of Sigismund III¹⁸ and Philip¹⁹ who were under control of the Jesuits, or in the simultaneity of the decline of the formerly powerful states in the 18th century"

¹⁸ Sigismund III Vasa (1566 –1632), King of Poland in 1587-1632.

¹⁹ It is not clear to whom of the three Habsburg kings of Spain in late 16-17th century K. Koźmiński refers: Philip II (1527-1598; king in 1556-1598), Philip III (1578 –1621, king in 1598-1621), or Philip IV (1605-1665, king in 1621-1665).

(Kozłowski 1967: 86).

The role of Catholicism or Jesuits as causes of the backwardness of Poland or Spain may be another „black legend“ (cp. Kieniewicz 2001). Whether these and other statements are true or false, is question for experts in the Poland's and Spain's history. The substantive validity of Lelewel's causal claims is not my issue in this paper. I am only interested in the latent logical structure of his arguments in the “Historical Parallel” and its formal validity. Obviously, Lelewel did not read John Stuart Mill's “A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive” (1843) where the logic of comparisons to test causal hypotheses is explained in detail. As a matter of principle, rules of logic are applied implicitly also by thinkers with no education in logic. Therefore, we can use them as the guidelines to check the validity of their arguments.

Lelewel's text has tabular form, with most pages divided into two columns. However, these columns contain not numbers, as in statistical tables, but text. The left column contains presentation of the specific episode in Spain's history, and the right column its equivalent or pendant in Poland's history. From time to

time both columns blend, these amalgamations containing text which points out relevant differences, similarities or presents observations about common all-European context for the episodes reported in the preceding columns. These “overlapping” text fragments also present information about the developments in selected other European countries during the same time periods.

The table 1 displays the manifest structure of Lelewel's arguments, presented according to contemporary conventions for data set construction. There are two cases and many variables, describing attributes or features, on which these two cases are similar or different. They include the outcome variable(s): decline and fall of Spain and Poland. According to Lelewel's original presentation, 1795 is the date of Poland's fall (final partition). For Spain this was 1808 (Napoleon's invasion). However, the decline of both countries started already in the 17th century. So depending on which outcome (decline or fall) is of interest, different variables as putative causes can be relevant. The list of independent variables includes geographical location, which was very different. Poland was

Table 1. **Manifest structure of Lelewel's argument in the “Historical Parallel of Spain with Poland in 16th, 17th, 18th centuries”.**

VARIABLES	CASES	
	POLAND	SPAIN
Geographical location		
Religion		
Form of government		
Mentality		
..... etc		
..... etc.		
OUTCOME	DECLINE AND FALL	DECLINE AND FALL

continental power with borders open in all directions. Spain is peninsular, with Pyrenees as natural border, separating it from France. Another variable is religion, with both countries being famous as pious Catholic nations; form of government (very different) and so on. I am not attempting complete reconstruction, because I am interested here only in the overall structure of Lelewel's reasoning.

The reconstruction of Lelewel's arguments as suggested in the table 1, helps us to assess their validity. Did Lelewel then succeed to demonstrate the irrelevance of republican constitution for decline and fall of *Rzeczpospolita* or to prove the fateful role of Catholicism by its comparison with Spain? As a matter of established wisdom in the logic of causal inference (going back to Mill 1916 (1843)), it is not possible to refute or prove causal hypothesis with observation of only two cases ($N=2$), except two situations. The comparison of only two cases is sufficient to test causal hypothesis, when these cases are identical except only one difference, which then explains different outcome. As a matter of fact, there are no such cases in the universe, with possible exception for the physical objects on the micro level (there can be completely identical atoms or molecules). Realistically, this ideal situation is approximated, when most similar cases with different outcomes are compared. Another situation with dyadic comparison producing valid causal conclusion involves the comparison of two completely different cases, sharing the only similarity which then explains similar outcome. This ideal standard can be approximated in the real world research when two most different cases with similar outcome

are compared.

Obviously, there were much more differences between Poland and Spain except difference in constitution, and much more similarities except similarity in religion. Therefore, these two countries cannot be considered neither as the most similar, nor as the most different cases. To control for these extra differences and similarities, additional cases are necessary. The greater the N , the more valid (or "statistically significant") the conclusion. Given many similarities and differences between the cases, multivariate comparisons between many cases are necessary to ground causal claims. Following limiting condition holds for such comparisons: the number of cases must exceed by large margin the number of relevant similarities and differences (technically called variables). In the terminology of statistics, this difference between the number of cases (N) and number of differences/similarities (variables), is called the number of "degrees of freedom". With two cases and two variables, the number of the degrees of freedom is $2-2=0$, so dyadic comparison of two cases cannot prove nothing. Of course, the exception should be made for the most different or most similar cases discussed above. But to find out that two cases are most similar or most different, they already must be compared to all remaining relevant cases ...

Can we then celebrate Lelewel as a pioneer of modern comparative history nevertheless? My answer is positive, because closer reading of the "Historical Parallel" validates the conclusion that his comparisons are dyadic only on the surface. In fact, they are multilateral or multivariate. Lelewel's population of cases

is $N > 2$, because in fact he compares Poland with Spain, but also with Russia, Sweden, and Germany; Spain in its turn is compared with French, England, Germany etc. So in fact Lelewel's argument is much more subtle and complex than just finding out the similarities and differences between two cases. Instead, it is based on the multivariate or multilateral comparison of more than 2 cases.

Table Nr. 2. **Latent (implicit) structure of Lelewel' arguments in the "Historical Parallel of Spain with Poland in 16th, 17th, 18th centuries."**

VARIABLES	CASES					
	POLAND	SPAIN	FRANCE	RUSSIA	GERMANY	ETC.
Geographical location						
Religion						
Form of government						
Mentality						
... Etc						
OUTCOME	DECLINE AND FALL	DECLINE AND FALL				

The table Nr. 2 suggests what real structure of Lelewel's argument is like. The complete reconstruction and assessment of this argument is big challenge, waiting for another occasion. Such work would involve close reading of the text to find out the exact number of variables and cases used by Lelewel. After all effort, many (if not most) data cells for cases other than Spain and Poland will remain empty. This means that Lelewel's text provides only the sketch of the multivariate argument, but not its complete version. However, this is also the case in the much of the contemporary work in contemporary comparative history, especially when it is presented in the narrative form.

Importantly, Lelewel's "Historical Parallel"

is not narrative text, but tabular in form. Very differently, there are no tables in Plutarch's "Parallel Lives". The use of tabular presentation form is unmistakable symptom of the influence of his self-education and teaching in statistics, theoretically reflected in his mature *Historyka*. At the same time, Lelewel's original tabular form misrepresents the structure of his argument as

dyadic comparison. Therefore, his "Historical Parallel" remains quasi-Plutarchean by its form (or superstructure), although it contains multilateral or multivariate comparisons in its content (or infrastructure). Lelewel's fame of the pioneer in comparative history is well-deserved.

7. Concluding Remarks

The main conclusion of this exploration of the historical context and evolution of Lelewel's historicis is that indeed his preoccupation with the methodology of history was not another "engine idling" case (cp. Wittgenstein 2009 (1953): 56), only steeling time from "doing history". Lelewel's bold idea of the essential unity of the history and statistics, conceived as political geography,

could contribute to his breakthrough as pioneer in comparative history. We can celebrate the anniversary of the first publication in the theory historical studies here in Lithuania not just as one of many events in the knowledge transfer of local interest. It was also as a part of breakthrough in the practice of historical studies of international importance.

Lelewel's knowledge of philosophy was rather limited (cp. Lelewel 1964: 812–825, 833–840) and was influenced by the “trench warfare” of his time between philosophers and historians over who has stronger entitlements to the scientific knowledge of history. Besides that, logic at Lelewel's time provided little guidance on the problems of the inductive reasoning. Therefore, classical dyadic comparisons learnt from Plutarch's work remained Lelewel's paramount source inspiration in his pioneering cross-country comparative work. However, he had another source of inspiration and learning: the working practices of the statistics of his time. He had to teach them to his students according

to his employment contract in 1822–1824. Therefore, he learned them, even if he disliked the statistical books where he did find too much more numbers and too few maps for his taste. Therefrom, Lelewel took over his tabular form of representation, in revolutionary way breaking with narrative form of representation, which remains canonical in the historical studies even in our days.

Two-column tabular form of exposition, used by Lelewel himself in his pioneering attempt at the comparative history (Lelewel 2006 (1831), only partly discloses real structure of his arguments, grounded in the multilateral or multivariate comparisons. Lelewel climbs to two column tables because his another source of inspiration were dyadic didactic comparisons, characteristic for Plutarchean tradition of comparative biographies. Although Lelewel's text contains only sketches of the multivariate comparative arguments, which therefore cannot lead to compelling conclusions, it is truly innovative in the context of the historical and

statistical scholarship of his times.

REFERENCES

Achenwall, Gottfried. 1749. *Abriss der neuesten Staatswissenschaft der vornehmsten europäischen Reichen und Republiken*. Göttingen: Joh. Wilhelm Schmidt.

Assorodobraj, Nina. 1961. „‘Historyki’ Lelewela“, *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, t.58 (4): 967–990.

Assorodobraj, Nina. 1964. „Wstęp“, in Lelewel, Joachim. 1964. *Dziela*. T. 2.1–2.2. *Pisma metodologiczne*. Opracowała Assorodobraj, Nina. Warszawa : Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, s. 7–93.

Baranova, Jūratė. 2000. *Istorijos filosofija*. Vilnius: Alma littera.

Bartninkas, Vilius. 2009. „A. Šliogeris: mergaitėms – mezgimo vadovėlis, vaikinams – Plutarchas“ [A.Šliogeris: For Girls – Knitting Tutorial, and for Boys – Plutarch], <<http://www.delfi.lt/news/ringas/lit/asliogeris-mergaitems-mezgimo-vadovelis-vaikinams-plutarchas.d?id=24979179>>. 02.12.2015.

Beauvois, Daniel. 2010. *Wilno – polska stolica kulturalna zaboru rosyjskiego 1803–1832*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Beresnevičiūtė-Nosalova, Halina. 1997. „Naujoji lietuviška istorika. Zenono Norkaus ‚Istorikos‘ recenzija [New Lithuanian Historics. A Review Article of Zenonas Norkus ‚Istorika‘], *Darbai ir die-*

nos, t. 5 (14), p. 285–286.

Blanke, Horst Walther. 1991. *Historiographie-geschichte als Historik*. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt : Frommann-Holzboog.

Blanke, Horst Walther; Fleischer, Dirk (Hrsg.) 1990. *Theoretiker der deutschen Aufklärungshistorie*. Bd.1-2. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.

Breyer, Carl. 1805. *Über den Begriff der Universalgeschichte*. Landshut: Weber.

Brzechczyn, Krzysztof; Paprzycka, Katarzyna (Eds). *Thinking about Provincialism in Thinking*. Poznań Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities, Vol. 100. Leiden: Rodopi/ Brill.

Büsching, Anton Friedrich. 1759. *Vorbereitung zur gründlichen und nützlichen Kenntniss der geographischen Beschaffenheit und Staatsverfassung der europäischen Reiche und Republiken: welche zugleich ein allgemeiner Abriss von Europa ist*. Hamburg: Bohn.

Chodyncki, Kazimierz. 1929. *Lata uniwersyteckie Lelewela, (1804–1808)*. Wilno: druk Józefa Zawadzkiego.

Conring, Hermann. 1694. *De Germanorum imperio romano liber unus*. Helmstad: G.W. Hamm.

Cyglar, Bogusław. 1969. *Działalność polityczno-społeczna Joachima Lelewela na emigracji w latach 1831–1861*. Gdańsk : Gdańskie Towarzystwo Naukowe.

Donnelly, Mark; Norton, Claire. 2011. *Doing History*. London: Routledge.

Donnelly, Michael. 1998 „From Political Arithmetic to Social Statistics: How Some Nineteenth Century Roots of the Social Sciences Were Implanted“, in Heilbron, Johan; Magnusson, Lars; Wittrock, Björn (Eds). *The Rise of the Social Sciences and the Formation of Modernity Conceptual Change in Context*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, p. 225–244.

Fabri, Johann Ernst. 1808. *Encyclopädie der historischen Hauptwissenschaften und deren Hilfsdoctrinen*. Erlangen: Johann Jakob Palm.

Fasolt, Constantin. 2004. *The Limits of History*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Fredrickson, George M. 1997. *The Comparative*

Imagination: On the History of Racism, Nationalism, and Social Movements. Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press.

Gatterer, Johann Christoph. 1764 (1761). *Handbuch der Universalhistorie nach ihrem gesamten Umfänge von Erschaffung der Welt bis zum Ursprunge der meisten heutigen Reiche und Staaten*. Göttingen : Vandenhoeck

Gieda, Aurelijus. 2013. *Istoriografija ir visuomenė: istorika, istoriko profesijos ir istorinės kultūros aspektai Lietuvoje 1904–1940 m.* [Historiography and Society: *Historik* and the Dimensions of the Profession of a Historian and the Historical Culture in Lithuania in 1904–1940]. Doctoral dissertation. Vilnius: Vilnius University, Faculty of History.

Gierl, Martin. 2012. *Geschichte als präzisierte Wissenschaft : Johann Christoph Gatterer und die Historiographie des 18. Jahrhunderts im ganzen Umfang*. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstadt : Frommann-Holzboog.

Handelsman, Marcelli. 1928 (1921). *Historyka: zasady metodologii i teorii poznania historycznego*. Podręcznik dla szkół wyższych. Wyd. 2., popr. i uzup. Warszawa : Nakł. Gebethnera i Wolffa.

Johannisson, Karin. 1990. „Society in Numbers: The Debate over Quantification in 18th-Century Political Economy“, in Frangsmyr, Tore; Heilbron Johan L. and Rider, Robin E. (Eds) *The Quantifying Spirit in the Eighteenth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, p. 343–363.

Jučas, Mečislovas. 1977. „Vilniaus universitetas 1803–1832 [Vilnius University 1803–1832]“, in Merkys, Vytautas (Ed.) *Vilniaus universiteto istorija 1803–1940* [History of the Vilnius University in 1803–1940]. Vilnius: Mokslas, p. 7–36.

Julkowska, Violetta. 1998. *Retoryka w narracji historycznej Joachima Lelewela*, Poznań: Instytut Historii UAM.

Karsavinas, Levas. 1929 (1918). *Istorijos teorija* [Theory of History]. Kaunas: Humanitarinių Mokslų fakulteto leidinys.

Kieniewicz, Jan. 1990. „Hiszpania – przykład czy wyzwanie?“, *Przegląd Powszechny*, Nr 1, s. 92–104.

Kieniewicz, Jan. 2001. *Hiszpania w zwierciadle polskim*. Gdańsk: Novus Orbis.

Kieniewicz, Jan. 2006. „Dlaczego trzeba czytać Lelewela?“, in Lelewel, Joachim. 2006 (1831). *Historyczna paralela Hiszpanii z Polską w XVI, XVII, XVIII wieku*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG, s. 7–15.

Kieniewicz, Jan. 2008. *Ekspansja. Kolonializm. Cywilizacja*. Warszawa: DiG 2008.

Kieniewicz, Jan. 2015. „Czy jest możliwa paralela historyczna między Hiszpanią a Polską? O doświadczeniu Lelewela po dwustu latach“ . Paper presented at the international conference “Joachim Lelewel Readings: Past, Historian’s Craft and Society in 19–21th centuries” on November 5–6th 2015 at the Vilnius university.

Kieniewicz, Stefan. 1964. *Samotnik brukselski: opowieść o Joachimie Lelewelu*. Wyd. 2 uzup. Warszawa : Wiedza Powszechna.

Kieniewicz, Stefan. 1990. *Joachim Lelewel*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.

Kosso, Peter. 2009. „Philosophy of Historiography”, in Tucker, Aviezer (Ed.). *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography*. Oxford: Blackwell, p. 9–25.

Koźmiński, Karol 1967. *Lelewel*. Toruń : Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza.

Lazutka, Stanislovas (Ed). 1987. *Joachimas Lelevelis*. Respublikinės mokslinės konferencijos, skirtos įžymaus mokslininko ir demokrato, Vilniaus universiteto profesoriaus Joachimo Lelevelio 200-sioms gimimo metinėms paminėti, medžiaga. [Joachim Lelewel. Materials of the Republican Scientific Conference to Commemorate 200-year Birth Anniversary of the Distinguished Scholar and Democrat, Vilnius University Professor Joachim Lelewel]. Vilnius: Vilniaus valstybinis V. Kapsuko universitetas.

Krzemieniecki, Leon. 1991. *Joachim Lelewel: narodowy portret sztukmistrza*. Wrocław : Nakl. Aut.

Lelewel, Joachim. 1815. *Historyka tudzież o łatwym i pożytecznym nauczaniu historyi*. W Wilnie; kosztem A. Żółkowskiego. W Druk. XX. Scholarum Piarum.

Lelewel, Joachim. 1826. *O historii, jej rozgałęzieniu i naukach związek z nią mających*. Warszawa : Jozef Puksza.

Lelewel, Joachim. 1852–1857. *Geographie du*

moyen âge. T.1–5. Bruxelles: Pilliet-Voglet.

Lelewel, Joachim. 1858. *Geografia. Opisanie krajów polskich*. Poznań : J.K. Żupański.

Lelewel, Joachim. 1957. *Dzieła*. T. 1. *Materiały autobiograficzne*. Opracowała Więckowska, Helena. Warszawa : Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Lelewel, Joachim. 1959 (1823). „Tematy rozpraw egzaminacyjnych i opinie o nich“, in Lelewel, Joachim. *Dzieła*. T. 3. *Wykłady kursowe z historii powszechnej w Uniwersytecie Wileńskim, 1822–1824*. Warszawa : Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, s. 44–694.

Lelewel, Joachim. 1959 (1850). „Wykład dziejow powszechnych“, in Lelewel, Joachim. *Dzieła*. T. 3. *Wykłady kursowe z historii powszechnej w Uniwersytecie Wileńskim, 1822–1824*. Warszawa : Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, s.97–674.

Lelewel, Joachim. 1959. *Dzieła*. T. 3. *Wykłady kursowe z historii powszechnej w Uniwersytecie Wileńskim, 1822–1824*. Opracował Marian Henryk Serejski. Warszawa : Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Lelewel, Joachim. 1964 (1815)a. *Historyka rękopiśmienna*, in Lelewel, Joachim. *Dzieła*. T. 2.1. Warszawa : Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, s. 97–177.

Lelewel, Joachim. 1964 (1815)b. *Historyka tudzież o łatwym i pożytecznym nauczaniu historyi*, in Lelewel, Joachim. *Dzieła*. T. 2.1. Warszawa : Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, s. 178–208.

Lelewel, Joachim. 1964 (1824). *Statystyka, czyli teoria, czyli zasady* [Sekstern] , in Lelewel, Joachim. *Dzieła*. T. 2.1. Warszawa : Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, s. 344–374.

Lelewel, Joachim. 1964 (1826). *O historii, jej rozgałęzieniu i naukach związek z nią mających*, in Lelewel, Joachim. *Dzieła*. T. 2.1. Warszawa : Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, s. 393–470.

Lelewel, Joachim. 1964. *Dzieła*. T. 2.1–2.2. *Pisma metodologiczne*. Opracowała Assorodobraj, Nina. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Lelewel, Joachim, 2011. *Dvejetas bibliografinių knygų*. T. 1. *Pirmosios bibliografinės knygos* [Two Bibliographic Books. Vol. 1. First Bibliographic

Books]. Vilnius: Versus aureus, 2011

Lelewel, Joachim. 2006 (1831). *Historyczna paralela Hiszpanii z Polską w XVI, XVII, XVIII wieku*. Warszawa : Wydawnictwo DiG.

Lelewel, Joachim. 1962. *Odpowiedź na ankietę historyczną François Guizota*. Z nieznanego autografu przełożył, przedmową i komentarzem opatrzył Marian Serejski. Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Lindenfeld, David F. 1997. *The Practical Imagination: The German Sciences of State in the Nineteenth Century*. Chicago: The Chicago UP.

Linz, Juan A.; Stepan, Alfred. 1996. *Problems of Democratic Consolidation. Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mężynski, Kazimierz. 1974. *Gotfryd Ernest Grodeck, profesor Adama Mickiewicza: próba rewizji*. Gdańsk : GTN.

Mill, John S. 1916 (1843). *System of Logic Ratiocinative and Inductive*. London: Longmans.

Modelski, Teofil Emil. 1929. „Sprawa powołania J. Lelewela na katedrę historii w Wilnie“, *Ateneum Wileńskie*, R.6, zeszyt 1–2, s. 167–201, zeszyt 3–4, s. 486–582.

Moszczeńska, Wanda. 1977 (1968). *Metodologii historii zarys krytyczny*. Do druku przygotował oraz wstępem poprzedził Jerzy Maternicki. 2-ie wyd., popr. i rozsz. Warszawa : Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Nalimov, Vasily. 1981. *In the Labyrinths of Language: A Mathematician's Journey*. Philadelphia: ISI Press.

Norkus, Zenonas. 1996. *Istorika, Istorinis įvadas* [Historics. An Historical Introduction]. Vilnius: Taura.

Pajewski, Janusz (red.) 1962. *Z badań nad pracami historycznymi Joachima Lelewela*. Prace Wydziału Filozoficzno-Historycznego, Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu, Seria historia, nr. 9. Poznań: UAM w Poznaniu.

Peters, Martin. 2003. *Altes Reich und Europa— der Historiker, Statistiker und Publizist August Ludwig (v.) Schlözer (1735–1809)*. Münster: LIT.

Petty, William. 1888. *Essays on Mankind and*

Political Arithmetic. London: Cassell.

Philipsen, Dirk. 2015. *The Little Big Number. How GDP Came to Rule the World and What to Do About It*. Princeton: Princeton UP.

Plutarch. 1914–1926. *Parallel Lives* (Loeb Classical Library) Vol. 1–11. Harvard: Harvard UP.

Plutarchos. 1801–1805. *Sławni ludzie i onych porównania*. Przekładania Filipa Neryusza Golanckiego. Vilnius: Druk. XX. Scholarum Piarum.

Porter, Theodore M. 1988. *The Rise of Statistical Thinking, 1820–1900*. Princeton: Princeton UP.

Przeworski, Adam. 1991. *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schönemann, Carl Traugott Gottlob. 1799. *Grundriß einer Encyclopädie der historischen Wissenschaften*. Göttingen: Johann Christian Dieterich.

Schlözer, August Ludwig. 1785. *Geschichte von Littauen, als einem eigenen Großfürstenthume, bis zum J. 1569*. Halle : Gebauer, 1785.

Schlözer, August Ludwig. 1804. *Theorie der Statistik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Serejski, Marian Henryk. 1958. *Koncepcja historii powszechnej Joachima Lelewela*. Warszawa : Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Sosnowska, Anna. 2004. *Zrozumieć zacofanie : spory historyków o Europę Wschodnią (1947–1994)*. Warszawa : Wydaw. „TRIO“.

Stadter, Philip A. 1992. (Ed.) *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition*. London : Routledge.

Szlajfer, Henryk, ed. 1990. *Economic Nationalism in East-Central Europe and South America 1918–1939*. Geneva: Librairie Droz.

Szlajfer, Henryk, 2013. *Economic Nationalism and Globalization. Lessons from Latin America and Central Europe*. Leiden: Brill.

Śliwiński, Artur. 1932 (1918). *Joachim Lelewel zarys biograficzny lata 1786–1831*. Wyd. 2. Warszawa : Wydaw. Kasy im. Mianowskiego-Inst. Popier. Nauki.

Šidlauskas, Algirdas. 1986. *Istorija Vilniaus universitete XIX a. pirmojoje pusėje* [History at the Vilnius University in the First Half of the XIXth Century]. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Šidlauskas, Algirdas. 1989. *Istorija Vilniaus universitete XVI a. pabaigoje – XIX a. pradžioje* [History at the Vilnius University from the Late XVI to the Early XIXth Century]. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Tucker, Aviezer. (Ed.) 2009. *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Vašiček, Zdeněk. 2009. Philosophy of History, in Tucker, Aviezer (Ed.) *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2009, p. 26–43.

Więckowska, Helena. 1980. *Joachim Lelewel uczonej, polityki, człowiek*. Warszawa : Czytelnik, 1980

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1986 (1953). *Philosophical Investigations*. 3^d ed. Translated by G. E. M. Anscombe. Oxford: Blackwell.

Аверинцев, Сергей Сергеевич. 1973. *Плутарх и античная биография. К вопросу о месте классика жанра в истории жанра* [Plutarch and Ancient Biography. On the Question of the Place of the Classic Scholar of the Genre in the History of Genre]. Москва: Наука.

Намавичюс, Зенонас. 1991. *Лелевель* [Lelewel]. Москва: Юридическая литература.

Птуха, Михаил Васильевич. 1945. *Очерки по истории статистики XVII–XVIII веков* [Essays on the History of Statistics in the XVII–XVIII Centuries]. Москва: Государственное издательство политической литературы.

Птуха, Михаил Васильевич. 1955–1959. *Очерки по истории статистики в СССР* [Essays on the History of Statistics in the USSR]. Т. I–II. Москва: Издательство АН СССР.

SANTRAUKA

ISTORIOGRAFIJOS TEORIJAI LIETUVOJE – DU ŠIMTAI METŲ, ARBA KAIP JOACHIMAS LELEWELIS TAPO MODERNIOSIOS LYGINAMOSIOS ISTORIJOS PIONIERIUMI

1815 m. žymus lenkų istorikas Joachimas Lelewelis (1786–1861) čia Vilniuje išleido “Istoriką”, tuo padarydamas pradžią istoriografijos teorijai Lietuvoje ir Lenkijoje. Straipsnio pagrindas – pranešimas, kurį straipsnio autorius perskaitė tarptautinėje konferencijoje, įvykusioje Vilniaus universitete 2015 m. lapkričio mėnesį šiai sukakčiai pažymėti. Jame atskleidžiama J. Lelewelio pažiūrų istorijos metodologijos klausimais evoliucija bei išryškinami jų originalūs bruožai. Pagrindinis dėmesys skiriamas Lelewelio metodologinių ir dalykinių istorijos tyrimų santykio klausimui: ar didžiulės lenkų istoriko pastangos ir laiko sąnaudos metodologinei refleksijai “atsipirko”, suteikdamos jam lyginamųjų konkurencinių pranašumų “darant istoriją”? Teigiama, kad J. Lelewelio esminio istorijos ir statistikos tapatumo nekonvencinė idėja jos autorių paskatino ir padėjo išplėtoti pionierišką 16–18 amž. Lenkijos ir Ispanijos palyginimą. Tam skirtame J. Lelewelio darbe naudojama tabularinę dėstymo formą bei implicitiškus daugiašalius multivariacinius palyginimus galima sieti su Lelewelio dviguba visuotinės istorijos ir statistikos profesoriaus institucine tapatybe Vilniaus universitete 1822–1824 metais. J. Lelewelio nekonvencinė istorijos ir statistikos santykio samprata yra tik dar viena šios dvigubos tapatybės išraiška. Kitas Lelewelio kaip komparatyvisto inspiracijos šaltinis – Plutarcho “Paralelinės biografijos”.

Department of Sociology,
Philosophy Faculty,
Vilnius University, Universiteto 9/1
zenonas.norkus@sf.vu.lt