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FROM A RUSSIAN GUBERNIYA TO PART OF FINLAND: THE LEGISLATIVE POSITION OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH AND PEOPLE IN THE GRAND DUCHY OF FINLAND IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Teuvo Laitila

What is today the Republic of Finland, had since the twelfth century been more or less a part of Sweden. In 1807 Russia promised to support the French supremacy policy in Western Europe in return for French support for the Russian seizure of Finland. A year later, Russia invaded Finland and occupied the whole country. In the 1809 Treaty of Fredikshamn (in Finnish, Hamina), Finland was annexed to Russia as an autonomous Grand Duchy. Three years later the southeastern part of Finland, the so-called ‘Old Finland’, or what in Russian was called the guberniya of Vyborg (in Finnish, Viipuri) — a territory Russia had taken between 1721 and 1743 — was incorporated into the rest of Finland. An overwhelming majority of around twenty-five to thirty thousand Orthodox people on Finnish soil lived in that territory, particularly in the Finno-Russian border area called Karelia. Administratively they were part of the Metropolinate of St Petersburg, although their closest superior was the Spiritual Board (later Consistory) at Vyborg (a town close to St Petersburg). At the local level they were divided into eight Finnish or Karelian-speaking parishes. In addition, there were three Russian-speaking parishes consisting of a few thousand members. During the nineteenth century, new parishes were established so that in 1890, there were 26 parishes with nearly 51,000 members, of which some one-fifth were Russian-speaking. The Orthodox made up some two per cent of the whole

1 University of Eastern Finland. My warm thanks to Thomas McElwain, PhD, for improving my English. All remaining possible errors are mine.
2 On the number of Orthodox see Koukkunen 1968; Surakka 1936:63.
3 By Karelia I here mean the areas around Lake Ladoga and in southeastern part of Finland. Karelian-speaking people of course also live elsewhere, for example, north from Ladoga and in Tver.
Finnish population; the rest were Lutherans.

The annexing of Finland to Russia and the unification of the guberniya of Vyborg with the rest of Finland had some important consequences for the Grand Duchy’s Orthodox people. First, they were incorporated into a culturally and legislatively foreign realm – although the same may be to some extent said of those Lutheran inhabitants of the guberniya who were reunited with their coreligionists after nearly one hundred years. But for the Orthodox, the change was more difficult, because, unlike their Lutheran fellow-citizens, they now were representatives of the empire’s main religion, which, nevertheless, within the Finnish borders was merely a tolerated one, the official religion being Lutheranism. Emperor Alexander I in 1809 decreed this state of affairs.

Another consequence was the creation of a border between the Finnish and the Russian parts of Karelia (see map page 30). Although Sweden and Russia had agreed on border issues several times from the early fourteenth century onwards, seldom had this resulted in great difficulties of movement between Karelia and the neighbouring Russian areas. Now, when the whole of Karelia was within the same empire, the separate economics and politics allowed to Finland resulted in stricter controls over passages from Finland into Russian territory. St Petersburg, which from the early eighteenth century onwards had been the economic centre of Karelia, and Olonets, just north from the Lake Ladoga — which was the traditional recruiting area for marriages for several families living within the borders of the Grand Duchy — were suddenly blocked by various legislative and administrative means for Karelians living in Finland. Although in practice it was impossible to prevent people from visiting St Petersburg or Olonets, the general policy of the Grand Duchy was to encourage Karelian inhabitants, Orthodox or otherwise, to abandon their Russian connections. This policy of course did not develop overnight; in practice it materialized only in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.5

In what follows I will discuss, in chronological order, the development of legislation in Finland relative to the Orthodox Church and people from 1809 to 1892. The first year marked the creation of the Grand Duchy of Finland and the latter the separation of Orthodox parishes of Finland from the Metropolinate of St Petersburg by the establishment of a separate Archbishopric of Finland. Thus, the last three decades of the Grand Duchy

5 See Loima 2001, passim.
until 1917, when Finland became independent, are outside the scope of this paper. The reason for not discussing these is twofold. Firstly, the establishment of the Archbishopric of Finland changed the position of Orthodox parishes; secondly, the last two decades, from around 1899 onwards, were marked by an intensified repealing (or as contemporary Finns said, Russification) of the Grand Duchy. This point deserves a separate treatment.

The discussion is divided into three sections. The first one describes the incorporation of the guberniya of Vyborg into Finland and the legislative solutions to the problems that rose before the construction of Finnish nationalism since the 1860s, due to the fact that Old Finland and the Grand Duchy created in 1809 had different laws relative to religion. The second section takes a closer look at two special cases, the law on parishes and the law on elementary education, both issued in 1883. The last section deals with the conflicts, which the two monasteries on Lake Ladoga, Valaam and Konevets faced when trying to manage their affairs in the ways they were accustomed to in Russia. The conclusion summarizes my understanding of the development of the legal status of the Orthodox Church in Finland. If not otherwise indicated, the dates are given according to the Gregorian calendar, which was officially used by the Grand Duchy.

The Gubeniya of Vyborg, a Special Orthodox Case in Lutheran Finland?

When in March 1809 Emperor Alexander I gave his sovereign pledge, which acknowledged the separate (Grand Duchy) state of Finland, he also sustained the country’s Swedish legislation from the eighteenth century. His predecessors had proceeded likewise when incorporating Old Finland into Russia in the early eighteenth century; the Lutheran people of the area had been granted the rights and privileges, which they had had under Swedish rule. Alexander’s statement meant that Lutheranism would remain the country’s official religion; members of other Christian churches only had the freedom to practice their religion. They also had most civil rights, but no right to be elected or to be appointed to governmental posts. They were also forbidden to establish schools or other educational institutions, as well as to marry a non-Orthodox. Briefly, while in Russia the Orthodox had a

---

6 Danielson-Kalmari 1931:121.
privileged position, in Finland they were second-class citizens.

This was not a big problem in 1809, because there were but a handful of Orthodox within the Finnish borders. It was neither a problem the next year, when the Orthodox in Finland were allowed, in June, to celebrate their great feast according to the Julian calendar, despite the fact that in the Lutheran Church feasts were celebrated according to the Gregorian one and the Swedish legislation had ordered the Orthodox in Finland to do likewise. But it became a problem when Old Finland was incorporated into Finland by two ukazes issued on 11 and 31 December 1811 (Old Style), respectively, and the number of Orthodox increased. The Lutherans argued that the 1810 statute did not free the Orthodox from observing major Lutheran feasts. The situation remained fuzzy and debated, until a statute, promulgated in January 1827, unequivocally relieved the Orthodox from observing Lutheran feasts.

Another, and larger, problem resulting in the December 1811 ukazes was that neither of them specified the rights of the Orthodox Church in the guberniya of Vyborg. A third statute, which for unknown reasons was not published in Finland, stated that Orthodox parishes and monasteries (Valaam and Konevets) in Old Finland would remain under the supervision of the Holy Synod and as a part of the Metropolinate of St Petersburg. In 1811, the Finnish Lutheran Church and the Finnish civil administration clearly had not thought about the matter at all, or, if they had, they assumed that, after becoming a part of Grand Duchy, the Orthodox in Old Finland were governed according to the old Swedish legislation.

During the next dozen years the Russian legislators felt it necessary to

---

8 Till hofrätterne, angående tillåtelse för de I Finland boende grekis-ryska troförfvandter, att fira deras stora kyrkhögtdider enling gamla stilen [To Court Judges, Relative to the Right of Members of Greek-Russian Faith to Celebrate Their Ecclesiastical Feasts According to the Old Style], SKB 1:8.

9 See Mäntylä 1954:50-51.

10 Hans kejserliga majestäts nådiga kungörelse, angående viborgské gouvernementets införlifwande med storfurstendömet Finland [His Imperial Majesty’s Gracious Declaration Relavive to the Incorporation of the Government of Vyborg to the Grand Duchy of Finland], SP 1:182; Hans kejserliga majestäts nådiga förordning, om det som i afseende å Viborgs läns förenings med Finland, iakttagats bör [His Imperial Majesty’s Gracious Order of Things to Be Taken into Account Relative to the Incorporation of the Government of Vyborg into the Grand Duchy of Finland], SP 1:182; Danielson-Kalmari 1931:98.


12 Danielson-Kalmari 1931:98.
specify the position of the Orthodox Church and the Orthodox parishes. Statutes issued in October 181613, in January and June 182414 on the guberniya's ecclesiastical matters stated that the Lutheran Chapter House of Borgå, which during the Swedish period had regulated the matters of the Orthodox parishes and people in Finland, had no right to meddle in the life of the Orthodox. In August 1823, Orthodox landowners in Old Finland were exempted from paying special taxes (a part of their salary) to Lutheran priests, as dictated by the Swedish regulations. The next year, the exemption was extended to cover the two Orthodox parishes in the adjacent guberniya of Kuopio.15 In November 1826 an imperial statute16 ordered that misconducts of duties and transgressions against morality by Orthodox priests and other servants of the Church, as well as their next of kin would be tried in Russian ecclesiastical courts. All these statutes were in accordance with the third statute from the year 1811, which remained unpublished in Finland.

Before 1812, the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church had paid the salaries of Orthodox priests. As from 1812, the Finnish Senate was obligated to pay the salaries previously paid by the Synod, annually around 7,000 Roubles in bank notes,17 to priests in urban parishes. In the countryside, local Orthodox land-owning peasants paid the priests’ salaries; the landless paid only for ceremonies, such as baptisms and funerals. Needless to say, the Senate did not support Orthodox monasteries (which according to the

---

13 Hans kejs. majesty’s nådiga förordning, angående rättegångs-ärendernas behandling vid domstolarne i Wiborgs län [His Imperial Majesty’s Gracious Order Relative to Legal Praxis in the Courts of the Government of Vyborg], Plac.2:337.
14 Hans kejs. majesty’s nådiga förordning, angående ecclesiastique-werket i Wyborgs län [His Imperial Majesty’s Gracious Order Relative to Ecclesiastical Institutions in the Government of Vyborg], Plac. 4:297; Till domkapitlet i Borga, rörande prestarättigheters utgörande från sådana i Karelen belägna hemmen, som innehaforas af grekiska trosförvandter [To the Chapter House of Borgå, Relative to Priests’ Rights in Karelia in Cases Involving Houses Inhabited by Members of Greek {i.e. Orthodox} Faith], SKB 2:123.
15 Vuorela 1980:36. In 1829 Orthodox of the Helsinki parish also obtained the same exemption. Vuorela 1980:38. The statute did not end disputes. In the late 1850s a Lutheran priest in the Karelian Isthmus still demanded the payment from some Orthodox. Vuorela 1980:314.
16 Hans kejs. majesty’s nådiga förordning, angående rättegången i mål, som angå brott och förbrytelser af de till grekiska församlingarne i Finland hörande prester ock kyrkobetjente med deras hustrus oeh barn [His Imperial Majesty’s Gracious Order Relative to Processes in Cases of Crimes and Offences Committed by Priests and Servants of the Church or Their Wives or Children Belonging to Greek {i.e. Orthodox} Parishes in Finland], SL 5:166. See also Danielson-Kalmari 1931:173-182.
17 In 1823 the sum increased to some 9,500 Rubles in silver. Danielson-Kalmari 1931:96.
Swedish legislation were illegal); and it paid the Orthodox priests less than the Lutheran ones.18

Regarding matters that concerned laymen, according to the 1781 Swedish legislation, a child born of a mixed marriage must be baptized in his father’s faith, unless the parents agreed otherwise, by written contract. After 1809, the few Orthodox priests who worked in urban centres of Finland garrisoned by Russians, continued to follow the Russian legislation and registered children born from mixed marriages into the Orthodox Church. Lutheran priests lodged a complaint to the Chapter House of Åbo, which referred the matter to the Finnish Senate. The Senate, in turn, passed it to the Emperor, who, in April 1812, issued a statute, which, however, covered only cases involving Orthodox persons temporarily living in Finland. According to the statute, a child born from mixed marriages should always be baptized in the parish of its father. Extramarital children should be baptized into the Church of their mothers, or, if neither father nor mother were known, into the Church of the majority, i.e., the Lutheran one.19

However, ‘certain parishes’ were excluded from the implementation of the statute. By these it is usually thought to mean those of the guberniya of Vyborg, where the Russian legislation on mixed marriages was in force. The situation changed in November 1836, when, on the initiative of the highest Russian official in Finland, the Governor-General20 (A. M. Menshikov) the 1812 legislation was extended to cover and also include Orthodox living permanently in Finland.21 The 1836 legislation did not single out ‘certain parishes’. In Finnish discussions, this has been interpreted to mean that, officially, the Russian legislation on mixed marriages was no longer in

19 Hans kejserliga majestäts nådiga förordning, angående det som vid äktenskaps afslutande emellan Finlands invånare och hans kejserliga majestäts öfrige undersåtare af annan religion iaktaras bör [His Imperial Majesty’s Gracious Order Relative to Matters That Should Be Take into Account in Marriages between Finnish Inhabitants and His Imperial Majesty’s Other Subjects], SP 1:295; Mäntylä 1954:44-46.
20 The Governor-general was an authority, who was directly and solely responsible to the Emperor. The office, as it existed in the Finnish Grand Duchy, had been established in 1775. Kalleinen 1994:26.
21 Hans kejserliga majestäts nådiga förordning, om ätskillihe tillägg uti förordningen af de 20 martii (1 april) 1812, angående det som vid äktenskaps afslutande emellan Finland invånare af evangelisk-lutherska trosebekännelsen och hans kejserliga majestät öfrige undersåtare af annan trostora iakttagas bör [His Imperial Majesty’s Gracious Order on Several Supplements to the Orders from 20 March (1 April) 1812, Relative to What Should Be Taken into Account in Marriages between Finnish Inhabitants Belonging to the Evangelical Lutheran Confession with His Majesty’s Subjects of Other Confessions], SP 7:163.
22 Mäntylä 1954:46.
practice in Old Finland.  

It seems that either in the guberniya of Vyborg, or, more probably, in that of Kuopio, some Lutheran priests were inclined to evangelize the Orthodox population, because in July 1817 the Emperor issued an imperial letter forbidding any proselytism. The text was open to interpretations and led to further cases of evangelization, although their number was evidently small. General Russian restrictions of Protestantism, particularly in the Baltic, which were completed in 1832, did not affect Finland. In 1843, Governor-General A. S. Menshikov drew up a proposal stating that on no pretext were the Lutheran priests allowed to meddle with the Orthodox officiating of services or to prevent baptizing into the Orthodox Church children who ‘according to the law’ had to be baptized, i.e., whose father was an Orthodox. The Emperor accepted the proposal in November of the same year. However, the order was not issued as a statute; the Senate and chapter houses in Finland were merely informed of the matter. Thus Finland was treated as a special case compared to other Protestant areas in Russia.

One of the problems resulting in the application of the Swedish legislation was that, outside of Old Finland, the Orthodox were excluded from public positions. The matter was first highlighted by local Orthodox peasants of Taipale, a parish in the guberniya of Kuopio. In 1821, peasants complained to Governor-General Fabian Steinheil that authorities, which were Lutherans, did not accept them as jurors in the local law court. The peasants evidently knew that the situation was different in the adjacent guberniya of Vyborg. Steinheil referred the matter to the Finnish Minister Secretary of State, Robert Rehbinder, who stated that the complaint was groundless, because the 1772 Swedish Constitution (which Alexander I in 1809 had declared valid for Finland) forbade appointing to public posts other than members of the Lutheran Church, who had to be native Swedish

---

22 Til hofrätterne och öfwer krigsdomstolen för finska milicen, angående forum för dem, som angifwas att hafwa till willfarelse eller affal från den ortodoxa grekiska religionen förledt någon som sig till samma troslära bekänner [To Judges of Court of Appeal and Military Court of the Finnish Armed Forces, Relative to Forum for Those Who Are Reported to Have Misled or Caused the Parting with Orthodox Greek Religion Someone Who Belongs to That Confession], SKB 1:253.
23 Inkinen 1934:198.
25 In sources and literature there appear two definitions of the parish, Taipale and Liperi. I have adopted the former, which is still in use.
26 Civil servant who represented the Finnish interest in St Petersburg. He was appointed by the Emperor and had direct access to him.
citizens.28

The peasants did not give up, and when the Governor-General was changed in 1823, they renewed their complaint. The new Governor-General, A. A. Zakrevsky, bypassed the Minister's Secretary and lodged the matter directly with Emperor Nikolai I. He, in turn, asked the Finnish Senate to make a report on the case. The Senate stated that if the 1772 Constitution was changed, it should take place in a parliamentary manner by the estates (which had not had a session since 1809). Zakrevsky retorted that even the Swedish kings had bypassed the estates, if they considered it necessary. Nikolai agreed, and in August 1827 the Senate, ordered by the Emperor, promulgated a statute that opened public posts to Orthodox Finnish citizens.29 Lutheran Finns criticized the statute as a violation of the privileges which Alexander I had granted them.30

The above-mentioned 1836 statute did not end disputes over mixed marriages. For example, as late as May 1864, the Lutheran vicar of the Impilahiti parish, located on the northwestern shore of the Lake Ladoga, (and thus in the middle of the guberniya of Vyborg), lodged a complaint to his superior, the Chapter House of Borgå, that Orthodox priests of the neighbouring parishes of Suistamo and Kitelä, had infringed the existing legislation by joining in marriage a Lutheran and an Orthodox. Moreover, the vicar alleged, supported by some of his colleagues, of which the most important was Bishop of Borgå, F. L. Schauman, the Orthodox priests had done this without the proper publication of the banns, a point with which the Orthodox priests were perhaps not very familiar, and without properly reporting the case to him (the vicar), which they should have done according to the law. The vicar also argued that the Orthodox priests had baptized children from a mixed marriage, the father being a Lutheran, into the Orthodox Church.31

The Governor-General (Platon Rokassovsky) asked the Holy Synod to investigate the matter. The Synod passed it on to the Spiritual Board at Vyborg, which, after having inspected the charges, ruled that they were groundless. The marriage in question was not a mixed one, because it was discovered that before the ceremony, and at his own request and with the permission of the Spiritual Board, the husband had joined the Orthodox Church. Similarly, the children had been baptized into the Orthodox Church.
on the ‘ardent request’ of the parents. Therefore Metropolitan Isidor of St Petersburg, who was a member of the Synod and the head of the Orthodox population in Finland, considered that nothing illegal had taken place.  

From the viewpoint of Russian legislation he was right. However, crux of the matter was that the vicar and his superior, Bishop Schauman, had based their accusations on the point that Russian legislation could not be applied in the Grand Duchy even for ecclesiastical matters, if it conflicted with the Finnish (or, in fact, Swedish) legislation; and according to the 1781 legislation, leaving the Lutheran Church was forbidden. Likewise, according to the 1812 law (see footnote 19), the children should have been baptized into the Lutheran Church. Thus, the accusers concluded, the Orthodox priests had rendered themselves guilty of proselytism.

Bishop Schauman pushed the matter further: he contacted the Finnish Minister Secretary of State, Alexander Armfelt, and asked him to lobby the Holy Synod to prevent further ‘proselytism’ in Finland. Armfelt discussed the matter with the head of the Holy Synod, Overprocurator Dimitry Tolstoy. In February 1869, Tolstoy sent Armfelt a letter stating that he had informed the Orthodox priests in Finland to pay strict attention to Finnish legislation. Tolstoy’s orders were codified into a statute, issued in April 1869.

One may assume that Tolstoy was so amenable, because he knew that, regarding accusations of proselytism, the statute would remain a dead letter; for in the next year, 1870, the new Law on the Lutheran Church made it possible to leave the Church and to join the Orthodox one; this happened in some rare cases. However, because Bishop Schauman was the architect of this law, one may conclude that his lobbying through Armfelt was a matter of principle and reflected the growing Finnish national consciousness, which saw all applications of Russian laws, be they ecclesiastical or civil, as a violation of Finnish rights. Schauman’s reaction can be seen as a logical step in the development, during which the guberniya of Vyborg was gradually separated from the sphere of Russian ecclesiastical legislation and

---

32 Mäntylä 1954:106. Similar episodes are known from the early 1800s, too. See Danielson-Kalmari 1931:140-142.
30 Ecklesiastik-expeditionens bref till samtliga guvernor och domkapitel, angående grekiska-ryska presterskapet i Finland från heliga synoden meddelad föreskrift att i sitt förhållande till evangelisk-lutherska trosekännare noge efterlefva landets författningar [Letter by the Ecclesiastic Expedition to All Governors and Chapter Houses, Relative to the Order Issued by the Holy Synod to Greek-Russian Priests In Finland That in Their Relations to the Members of the Evangelical Lutheran Confession Strictly Follow the Land’s Statutes], SFF 10/1869:4; Mäntylä 1954:107.
incorporated in the Finnish civil legislation.

Until the 1880s, this development took place through incidental cases; despite Emperor Nikolai I’s emphasis on Orthodox conservatism and his successor, Alexander II’s, attempts to increase liberalism, neither Russian nor Lutheran legislators seem to have had any comprehensive views about religious policy in the guberniya of Vyborg or in Finland proper. Moreover, there were cases favouring Orthodox, such as the 1872 order on the organization of education in schools (in Finnish, koulujärjestys), which exempted the Orthodox children (those who were Finnish citizens) from compulsory classes on ‘general’ (i.e., Lutheran) teaching of religion. The situation started to change during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, when nationalistic policies gained momentum in both the Grand Duchy and the Russian Empire.

Incorporating Orthodox Parishes into the Finnish Legislative System: Two Statutes of 1883 and Their Vicissitudes

The Statute on Parishes

In May 1883, on the order of Emperor Alexander III, the Finnish Senate issued two statutes regarding Orthodox rural parishes. One of them concerned the legislative status of clergy and churches in Orthodox parishes and the other, elementary education provided by Orthodox rural parishes.

The first statute was important even in the imperial context. Since Peter the Great, both the legislative status and the geographical borders of Orthodox parishes had been vague or muddled, because Peter’s policy had been to break the role of parishes and priests as local forces and to subject them to the Holy Synod.

According to the statute on clergy and churches, the priests sent to

---

34 Hans kejserliga majestäts nådiga skolorder för Storfusterndömet Finland [His Imperial Majesty’s Gracious Order on School Order for the Grand Duchy of Finland], SFF 26/1872:1.
35 Hans kejserlige majeståts nådige forordning, innefattande särskilda bestämmningar rörande priesterskapet och kyrkorna i grekisk-ryska församlingarna i Finland [His Imperial Majesty’s Gracious Order, Concerning Special Warrants on Clergy and Church-buildings in the Greek-Russian Parishes in Finland], SFF 12/1883:1; Hans kejserliga majeståts nådige förordning, angående baraudervisningen i de grekis-ryska församlingarna i Finland [His Imperial Majesty’s Gracious Order, Relative to the Education of Children in the Greek-Russian Rural Parishes in Finland], SFF 12/1883:9.
Orthodox parishes in Finland should know Finnish. Those who did not command the language were required to learn it in order to be able to officiate in Finnish. The statute also required the clergy to keep registers of their parishioners and perform the same duties in regards to elementary school and relief of the poor, which, according to the Finnish legislation, belonged to the Lutheran priests. Moreover, the statute established, on paper, the parish council as the highest administrative agent of the parish. The council’s task was, together with the priest, to agree on his salary, to make decisions on collecting money for the eventual repair of parish churches, and to decide on the founding of elementary schools run by the parish and the number and the hiring of their teachers.

However, the 1883 statute had at least one major shortcoming; namely, it did not specify the status of the parish as an economic and administrative body. It listed the parish council’s tasks, but did not specify whether or not the council was a juridical body liable to finance and carry them out. From the viewpoint of the Russian Orthodox Church, this was not a problem, because a parish was not a self-sustaining entity but a part of the Church that covered its expenses. This was not the Senate’s understanding of the matter: they wanted to reduce the economic and administrative connections between the parishes in Finland and their superiors in Russia and to supervise the foundation of parishes and churches, just as was the case of Lutheran parishes. To accomplish this, the question about the nature of the parish councils was submitted in November 1885 to the Senate’s legislative council. The latter heard representatives of the Orthodox clergy and laymen, discussed the matter and tendered, in December 1886, a proposal that contained a detailed clarification of the parish’s economics and administration. The submission was an application of the 1869 Lutheran parish regulations and thus differed from anything that was in force in Russia regarding the Orthodox parishes.

The proposal was discussed several times at the Senate’s meetings before it was accepted in December 1888 and sent to the Finnish Minister Secretary of State, Johan Ehmrooth, who handed it over to the Holy Synod. The Synod, in turn, asked the opinion of the Spiritual Board at Vyborg, which convened the assembly of Orthodox priests in Finland in June 1890. The

---

37 Finnish translation of the Divine Liturgy had appeared in 1862. Finnish had been taught at the St Petersburg Priest Seminary since 1826 for those priest candidates who were to be sent to work in Finland.
assembly wished to strengthen the role of the Spiritual Board in the parish administration and to reduce that of the Senate, which was contrary to what the latter had proposed. The assembly also suggested that Orthodox who were not Finnish citizens could be parish members and that the Orthodox parishes follow in all cases the Russian canonical and civil laws, if there were no clear regulations in the Finnish legislation. The Spiritual Board agreed and sent the proposal to the Governor-General. He passed it over to the Senate, which referred the case back to the legislative council in June 1891.39

The council’s statement did not differ much from the 1886 proposal. In August 1892, it was sent to the Holy Synod, which, however, was busy in the reorganization of the Metropolinate of St Petersburg, resulting in the foundation of the diocese of Finland. Thus it took a year, until December 1893, before the reworked proposal was re-submitted to the Spiritual Board at Vyborg. The Board repeated its motion on strengthening its own role in some details relative to complaints and administration, but did not meddle with the parish’s economics or property ownership. According to Pispala, the Board’s proposal aimed at a compromise between the Senate and the Holy Synod.40

To follow up this process, I have here to transgress the limit I imposed for this article. Namely, in the spring of 1896 the Spiritual Board sent its proposal to the Holy Synod. The Synod passed it to the Finnish Minister Secretary of the State, who delivered it over to the Governor-General. He, in turn, submitted it to the Senate, which referred it to the economic council. It discussed the matter in December 1897 and relegated the proposal to a special committee consisting of three senators. The committee made some minor changes, for example, instead of ‘the Greek-Russian Church’ they proposed the designation ‘Greek Catholic’, which also was accepted; thus the Orthodox in Finland were officially called ‘Greek Catholics’ until 1954. Then the proposal was sent back to the Synod via the economic council, the Senate, Governor-General, etc.41

For several reasons (the on-going discussion on the renewal of the Russian Church, political turmoil, such as the 1904–1905 Russo-Japanese War) the Synod considered the committee’s proposal only in the summer of 1905. It noted that the acting Archbishop of Finland, Sergey (the future Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia), supported the proposal saying that it

40 Pispala 1984:139-142.
41 Pispala 1984:142-145.
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The statute established two bodies, the parish assembly and the parish council, the former being the decision-making body and the latter the executive one. Furthermore, it specified the cases, which ecclesiastical bodies could handle on their own, and those, in which they needed to ask the opinion of the local governor or the Finnish Senate. It also specified the cases in which the secular authorities had to consult the Spiritual Board or the Holy Synod. Thus the statute made the parishes economically and administratively part of the Grand Duchy and equivalent to the Lutheran parishes. Comparable regulations did not exist for any other Orthodox parishes in Russia.

The Statute on Elementary Orthodox Education

Until the 1860s, primary education in Finland was in the hands of the Church. In practice, this usually meant Lutheran education, for there were very few Orthodox elementary (or other) schools in Finland. In 1866, the secular authorities took responsibility for all but elementary education.

At about the same time, in 1862, in the guberniya of Kuopio, a local newspaper, Tapio, argued that the education provided by the guberniya’s Orthodox parishes (Taipale and Ilomantsi) was of poor quality. Governor-General P. I. Rokassovsky ordered the Governor of Kuopio, Knut Furuhjelm, to investigate the matter. Furuhjelm convened an assembly of Taipale’s parish, heard the parish members, and reported to Rokassovsky: ‘Children’s elementary education, poor relief, care-taking of granaries [which was one of the parish’s tasks], funds for poor and the parish as well as keeping of parish register and other things are for the most part in full disarray.’

The reason

---

42 Pispala 1984:165-166.
44 See in general Koukkunen 1968.
45 The name is a common first name in Finland. In Finnish folk tradition, it is the name of the lord of forest.
46 Quoted in Mäntylä 1954:76.
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for this was obviously that the parish priests, being Russians and not knowing Finnish, were ignorant of what the Grand Duchy’s legislation expected them to do, because even before receiving Furuhjelm’s letter, Rokassovsky had informed the Holy Synod’s Overprocurator, A. P. Ahmatov, that priests appointed to Orthodox parishes in Finland had to know Finnish.48

In 1862, Furuhjelm was transferred to the Senate’s economic council. His successor, Samuel Henrik Antell, also paid attention to the level of Orthodox education. Two years later, in August 1864, he had a meeting with Ilomantsi’s Orthodox priest, Ioan Albinski, and the parish members. According to Antell, Fr. Ioan argued that, due to the fact that Orthodox services were in Slavonic, whereas the Lutheran ones were in Finnish, his parishioners preferred the latter. The real reason, Antell concluded in his letter to Rokassovsky in November 1864, was the ignorance of the parish members: ‘One had to do something to improve the spiritual level of the parish. Ignorance of the dogma of the Church, and therefore also indifference to her, is substantial.’49 A year later (1865) the Holy Synod ordered that in rural Finnish Orthodox parishes, the liturgy had to be conducted in the local language.

Thanks to Furuhjelm’s information on Taipale, Rokassovsky asked the Governor of the guberniya of Vyborg, Bernhard Idrenius, to report on the state of the guberniya’s Orthodox education in April 1864. In his statement to the Governor-General, Idrenius blamed the Holy Synod for insufficient economic support for education; the local peasants were too poor to pay a teacher and therefore elementary (and other) education of children, particularly in Finnish, either did not materialize at all or was sporadic, a point that the Governor-General regretted.50

Antell, evidently learning of Idrenius’s report, wrote in early 1866, to the Holy Synod’s Overprocurator, D. S. Tolstoy, (who also was Minister of Education in Russia), suggesting the development of elementary Orthodox education, the translation and publication of textbooks in Finnish and the founding of new school buildings. He also proposed the appointment of Finnish-speaking priests to Orthodox parishes in Finland and the exemption of Orthodox priests from secular duties (dictated by Finnish legislation).

Finally, he recommended the Synod to appoint a committee to further investigate the matter. 51

Tolstoy informed the Emperor, who in March 1866 appointed such a committee and nominated Tolstoy to head it; Antell was one of its four other members. The other member from Finland was the head of the Spiritual Board at Vyborg, Fr. Vladimir Vinogradov. The committee submitted its memorandum to the Holy Synod in early 1869. It mainly followed Antell’s above-mentioned letter to Tolstoy, suggesting that the parish priests should concentrate on spiritual, and not secular, matters; that in rural Finnish parishes they should know Finnish (urban parishes were mainly Russian-speaking); and that elementary education should be given regularly, and in Finnish. Because there was shortage of Finnish-speaking teachers, the committee also proposed the foundation of a teacher seminary at Sortavala (a town on the northwestern shore of Lake Ladoga). 52 The Synod discussed the memorandum in November 1869 and agreed to most of the points; the only major change it made was relative to the language of education, which in the Synod’s opinion should be Russian. 53

The Finnish Senate, which next discussed the matter, strongly opposed Russian-language education of the Orthodox, but not the foundation of a Synod-led seminary. The Senate’s point, of which Tolstoy was informed in March 1870, was that by Russian-language education in elementary schools in Finland it was impossible to achieve the aimed-for goal, i.e. the improvement of the parishioners’ knowledge of Orthodoxy, because they usually did not understand Russian. Tolstoy retorted two months later by sending a letter to the Finnish Minister Secretary of State, Alexander Armfelt, reasoning that Finnish could be used only temporarily, until the pupils learned Russian. To support his case, Tolstoy referred to an imperial ukaz on the elementary education of non-Russians, issued in March 1870, which expressed the same idea. 54

The Senate repudiated Tolstoy’s proposal and sent the matter back to the Synod in July 1870. Later that year O. M. Nimbus, the pseudonym of a Finnish linguist, Torsten G. Aminoff, suggested the foundation of a seminary in Eastern Finland to educate teachers and priests for the Orthodox parishes.

---

51 Antell to Tolstoy (a concept, no date), NARC, AG-G, Acts of the Governor-General’s Office 1857-1869.
52 Merikoski 1939:52-54; Mäntylä 1954:85-86.
53 Railas 1952:76-77.
54 Railas 1952:89-90.
in Finland. He also proposed the consecration of their own bishop for the Orthodox in Finland. Nimbus concluded that the bishop could also take care of the Finnish-speaking Orthodox in Russia. Both ideas materialized in the late 1800s. The seminary (for teachers only, intended for both the Lutheran and Orthodox of Karelia) was founded at Sortavala in 1880, although not under the Synod but of that of the Finnish Ministry of Education. The Orthodox in Finland got their own bishop in 1892, when the above-mentioned Archdiocese of Finland was established. However, he did not supervise the Finnish-speaking Orthodox outside the Grand Duchy.

Parallel to the foundation of the seminary, the Finnish authorities and the Holy Synod continued to disagree over the language of education in the Orthodox elementary schools. The Finnish Senate asked the opinion of the Finnish Ministry of Education in February 1878. The Head of the Ministry, Uno Cygnaeus, emphasized the interdependence of education, language and national identity; thus the language in schools, including elementary ones, as well as the nationality of teachers should be Finnish. The Senate then appointed a committee to investigate the issue in October 1878. Following Tolstoy’s 1870 reasoning, the committee suggested the promulgation of a law on Orthodox parishes and education. To realize this, a new committee was appointed, which formulated the outlines of the statute on Orthodox parishes discussed in the previous section, and another on education. The draft statutes were then sent to the Emperor, who, as mentioned above, accepted them.

The statute on Orthodox elementary education in rural Orthodox parishes in Finland declared that education be the task of parents and parishes and obligated all rural Orthodox parishes in the Grand Duchy to teach children religion and their mother tongue in cases where such education was not provided by the parents. The language of education should be ‘that of the local people’. In Russia a similar statute was issued a year later, in June 1884.

As to the teaching of religion, the statute ordered the Orthodox priests to supervise the general contents of religious teaching in schools. In principle, the statute created problems in schools where there were both

---

55 The article was published in the (handwritten) Savo-Karelian Student Association’s magazine Savo-Karjala nr. 7/1870. Quoted in Railas 1952:103-104.
56 Officially the Supreme Board of Education, in Finnish, kouluvaltiotus.
57 Cygnaeus’s report to the Senate in April 1878, quoted in Railas 1952:119-120.
59 Chukov 1910:3.
Lutheran and Orthodox pupils, but only one teacher (whose confession was
determined according to that of the majority; in practice he or she was usually
a Lutheran). In practice, the problem materialized in the two Orthodox rural
parishes of the guberniya of Kuopio. In early 1885, the Holy Synod’s journal
Tserkovniya vedomosti published an article by Aleksandr Borotinsky, head
(in Russian, nastoyateI) of Taipale Orthodox parish, entitled: “How are
School Teachers and Authorities in Finland Disposed Towards Orthodoxy?”
Fr. Borotinsky’s answer was that the authorities regarded the teaching of
Orthodoxy with suspicion. He also argued that Orthodox children in Taipale
had to attend a school, where the (only) teacher was ‘both Lutheran and a
fanatic’, and added that he had heard of the situation being the same in the
parish of Suistamo, close to Lake Ladoga.

Following Borotinsky’s letter, the Russian Minister of Education, Ivan
Delyanov, asked Governor-General Heiden to take action. Heiden ordered
the governors of Kuopio and Vyborg to investigate the accusations. Evidently, education had not been proper in all respects, because the
representatives of Orthodox and Lutheran parishioners in Taipale organized
a meeting at the school Borotinsky had mentioned, and decided that of the six
weekly classes on religion four (on Bible History) would be given by the
Lutheran teacher; the other two (on creed) were to be taught according to the
pupil’s confession. In fact, that is what actually had happened since 1878,
when Borotinsky was appointed in Taipale. The investigation in Suistamo in
late summer 1885 showed that in all of the parish’s schools, teachers of both
confessions worked in complete and mutual understanding. Thus there was
no factual ground for Borotinsky’s accusations. I presume that he above all
wanted to get support for the practice he had started, because it seems that
until 1878, the Lutheran teacher in Taipale had taught all six classes, even
those on creed, which was contrary to the 1872 order on education.

On the basis of the information he got, Heiden reported to Delyanov
that there were some shortcomings in the religious education of the Orthodox
pupils. The main reason for this, in Heiden’s opinion, was that too few
Orthodox teachers had thus far graduated from the teacher seminary at
Sortavala (where the overwhelming majority of students were Lutherans); it
was therefore impossible to teach all Orthodox pupils according to their

---
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Delyanov passed the information over to the Holy Synod, which sent it to the Spiritual Board at Vyborg. The Board’s new chairman, Fr. Vasily Glebov, nastoyatel of the Vyborg parish, was not satisfied. To improve the situation, he suggested to Heiden that separate schools for Orthodox be founded. The idea was not totally new, as some other Orthodox in Finland had put it forward. However, they had changed their mind after having learned how much it would cost the parishes; they simply could not afford schools of their own.

Nevertheless, Heiden referred Fr. Vasily’s proposal to the Senate, which sent it to the Finnish Ministry of Education. The Ministry stated, in a memorandum dated March 1886, that in schools having pupils from both Lutheran and Orthodox confessions, Bible History should be taught by the school’s teachers (their confession was not specified) on the basis of textbooks accepted by the clergy (meaning obviously both Lutheran and Orthodox ones). The clergy would also supervise teaching (how this would happen was not indicated); creed should be taught according to each student’s confession and by the clergy. Thus the Senate’s motion followed the practice adopted in the previous year at Taipale.

The Holy Synod opposed the teaching of Bible History to Orthodox by a Lutheran teacher. Thus the Senate revised the wording so that in schools where there was but one teacher (whose confession, as mentioned, depended on the confession of the majority) the religious education of the other confession in its entirety would be given by the clergy. The Senate promulgated a statute confirming this point in December 1888.

It seems that all parties were satisfied with the statute. However, the situation started to change after the foundation of the Archbishopric of Finland in December 1892 and the rise of nationalistic tendencies. In December 1893 the conservative Moscow daily Moskovskiy vedomosti published an article containing a detailed proposition about the development of the Archbishopric of Finland. It suggested the founding of new churches, church-run hospitals and charity organizations, and Russian-language
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newspapers. In January the following year the St Petersburg-based Novoye Vremiya recommended the setting-up of Russian-language schools for Orthodox children in Finland.68 These proposals started to materialize in the late 1890s, after Nikolai Bobrikov was appointed the Governor-General of Finland and, according to nationalistic Finnish history writing, the first period of Russification of the Grand Duchy began, ending in the 1905 so-called ‘Bourgeois Revolution’ in Russia. The second, and last, Russification period was from 1909 to 1914; but they are already outside the scope of this article.69

Orthodox Monasteries in the Lutheran Grand Duchy

As already mentioned, according to the Swedish legislation, monasteries were forbidden in Finland. Since 1812, in the Grand Duchy there were two monasteries, Valaam and Konevets. In 1889, a third monastery was opened, or, in fact, reopened, after three centuries of discontinuation, in Pechenga, close to the Arctic Ocean; and in 1906 a convent for women, established ten years earlier in Terijoki in the Karelian Isthmus, was consecrated as a nunnery.

Both Valaam and Konevets had been established in the fourteenth century70, discontinued due to wars several times and re-established in the late 1710s. At the time of their annexation to the Grand Duchy they, and particularly Valaam, had developed into flourishing spiritual and economic centres. Even emperors, such as Alexander I, favoured and patronized the Ladogan monasteries.71

The monasteries’ economic development was based on donations by noblemen and by the Emperor,72 both in cash and real property and, before 1812, in land. Thanks to the property they owned in Old Finland, Valaam and Konevets (but occasionally also Orthodox parishes) litigated with both local

70 The date for Valaam is contested. Modern scholars usually prefer dating it to the fourteenth century, whereas the monastic tradition, and scholars who are faithful to it, date its foundation to the eleventh century. For the former view see Okhotina-Lind 1996, for the latter, Kirkinen 1995.
71 On Valaam in general see Shumov 2005; on Konevets, Heikkinen 1983.
72 Paul I (1796–1801) had donated, in 1797, to each monastery in Russia 30 desyatinas (ca 32 hectares) of land around and close to Lake Ladoga. Valaam also got fishing rights at the River Kymi (then the border river between Sweden and Russia). Danielsson-Kalmari 1931:98.
people and the Finnish Senate. Since the eve of the annexing of Old Finland to the Grand Duchy in 1812, local people, particularly close to the River Kymi, which had been the Russo-Swedish border in southeast from 1721 to 1809, accused monks of Valaam of fishing on waters where they had no rights. The quarrel was tried many times in several court sessions until 1847, when the conflict was settled officially by renting the debated areas, with Emperor Nikolai I’s approval, ‘in perpetuity’ to the Finnish State; up till then, the monastery had leased them to local people.73 Governor-General Menshikov initially proposed the solution in 1845.74 Although this in practice did not invalidate Valaam’s rights, by taking responsibility over the disputed areas, the Senate in practice nationalized them. However, nobody protested.

After Finnish nationalism started to develop in the 1860s, in parallel to Emperor Alexander II’s liberal policies, the economic activities of Valaam and Konevets roused the Senate’s suspicion. In 1866, Valaam rented new fishing rights in Sortavala. During the next few years it also bought real estate in several Karelian parishes located west of Sortavala, mainly to secure the supply of firewood and timber for the monastery. The Senate learned about these transactions in March 1871, when governor of the guberniya of Vyborg, General and Senator Christian Theodor Oker-Blom, recommended the ratification of one of them, the right to inherit a state-owned property. The Senate asked the opinion of Procurator (Attorney General) Johan Philip Palmén, who stated, in May 1872, that the Governor had in this particular case exceeded his authority, because, according to Finnish law (a statute promulgated in February 1851 stating that Finnish citizens had the right to own property without imperial permission), such a right could be granted only to persons, not institutions. However, the procurator also argued that because there were no statutes forbidding established institutions from owning property in Finland, Valaam had, generally speaking, the right to possess and acquire real property.75

This was something the Senate had not expected, nor wished, when it had asked Palmén’s view. Thus it ordered the Court of Appeal in Vyborg to investigate the operations of the heads of the two local courts who had accepted Valaam’s transactions. They were found guilty and were imposed a fine for ignoring the same 1851 statute which Palmén had referred to.76 This

73 Danielson-Kalmari 1931:111-129.
74 Kalleinen 1994:249.
76 Danielson-Kalmari 1931:131.
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indicates a clear change in the Senate’s policy. Thus far it had not questioned the monasteries’ right to own real property, but with the rise of Finnish nationalism, it was no more willing to tolerate it. However, the target was not, or not only, Valaam, but the Russian ownership in the _guberniya_ of Vyborg in general. Namely, during the eighteenth century, a substantial part of the _guberniya_ had been donated to noblemen. After 1812, the peasants tilling these donated lands paid taxes, first to the state and since 1827, to their landlord. However, they were neither willing to pay the often high taxes nor to move, which was the alternative given to them. This resulted in several court processes. To solve the impasse, in 1863 the Finnish Diet decided to buy to the Grand Duchy donated land every time it went on sale.77

This process of buying Russian landowners out of Old Finland alarmed the Spiritual Board at Vyborg. It sent the Senate a letter asking under which conditions Valaam’s right could be recognized to the property that it had bought.78 In its answer, in November 1874, the Senate considered Valaam’s right being in principle against the 1847 statute, evidently interpreting it so that Valaam had no rights to purchase more land. To solve the matter, the Senate offered to pay cash for the property at the same price for which Valaam had bought it. The monastery, not being content, passed the matter to the Holy Synod. The Synod supported the monastery’s rights and referred the question back to the Senate, which once again asked Procurator Palmén’s opinion. He now came to a contrary conclusion to that of 1872, arguing that although the Finnish laws did not prevent the monastery from owning property, the main question was, whether or not Valaam really needed more land. Palmén’s argument was that it did not; thus, and because the monastery represented views that ‘radically differed’ from the Finnish legislation, he dismissed the request and, following the Senate, suggested that Valaam’s latest acquisitions should be cashed in by the Senate and that the Emperor would forbid the monasteries to buy more property in Finland. This reasoning was sent to the Holy Synod.79

The Synod asked the opinion of the Finnish Minister Secretary of the State, Alexander Armfelt, who agreed with the Senate and asked the Synod to word their final statement so that Minister Secretary could send it back to the Senate and, after that, submit it to the Emperor. The Synod evidently was astounded and did not hasten to formulate its view. In early 1877, the new

---

78 See Danielson-Kalmari 1931:131.
79 Danielson-Kalmari 1931:131-134.
Minister Secretary, C. E. Stjernvall-Walleen, reminded the Synod of the matter, and in May 1877 the Senate got the Synod’s position, which, predictably, had not changed. Nevertheless, the Senate repeated its earlier view, according to which Valaam had no right on its newer acquisitions, which therefore should be cashed in by the Grand Duchy. The case finally went to the Emperor (Alexander II), who partly confirmed the Senate by ordering that Valaam had the right to keep the property which it owned, but had no right to buy more without imperial permission (which was the common practice in Russia). This verdict ended disputes over property between Valaam and the Senate. 80

A similar argument took place in the early 1880s between the Senate and the Konevets monastery, when the latter tried to secure its rights to possess the property that it had bought in Finland. The Emperor’s decision was the same as in the case of Valaam; Konevets’s rights to the property that it already owned were granted, but new acquisitions should be submitted to the Emperor. 81

In the late 1880s, a new conflict broke up between the monasteries and the Finnish Senate. In December 1860, the Emperor had granted Valaam and Konevets permission for tax-free import of foodstuff and materials they needed. At first there were no problems, but in July 1887, the Emperor’s brother, Grand Duke Vladimir, visited Valaam on the occasion of the laying the cornerstone of the new cathedral. Then he also talked with the hegumen, who complained that Finnish authorities in Sortavala (the Ladogan harbour from which boats to Valaam set sail) harassed the pilgrims to Valaam by inappropriate customs inspections. The hegumen also complained about taxes imposed on the monastery by the Finnish authorities. The Grand Duke lodged these complaints with the Holy Synod and suggested the separation of Valaam from Finland and its incorporation to the guberniya of St Petersburg. Vladimir also considered placing the whole guberniya of Vyborg under direct Russian rule. 82

The Synod demanded that the hegumen clarify the complaints and, after having got a full report, referred the matter to the Governor-General, Fedor Heiden, who passed it over to the Finnish Senate. After having heard

80 Koukkunen 1969:70-76.
81 Koukkunen 1973:24, 26-27.
82 Koukkunen 1973:27. The idea of re-drawing the Grand Duchy’s and Russia’s southeastern border was not new, such proposals had been put forwards since 1830s (see Danielson-Kalmari 1931:485-523).
the National Board of Customs, the Senate proposed, in early 1888, that goods and articles that were taken from the customs directly to Valaam be tax-free. However, this did not end the complaints. Therefore, Heiden suggested that Valaam be declared a free port. The Senate, now conscious of Grand Duke Vladimir’s proposal of changing the status of the guberniya of Vyborg, conceded; so in January 1889 Valaam was made a free port. The decision ended disputes over customs, and also the discussion on changing the guberniya’s border.83 Thus, at the end of the nineteenth century, Valaam got a sort of autonomous status between the Russian Empire and the Grand Duchy. In independent Finland this resulted in suspicions of the monastery being a ‘Russian fifth column’ within the ‘pure’ Finnish state.

Conclusions

In the early nineteenth century, neither Finnish nor Russian authorities were concerned with the status and position of Orthodox citizens of Finland. Russian authorities were mainly interested in improving legislation on concrete cases where Russian ecclesiastical laws, which Russians considered valid for Old Finland, contradicted the Swedish constitution that Emperor Alexander I had kept in force after annexing Finland in 1809. At first, the Finnish authorities made concessions. The Russian aim was to maintain the legislative level of Orthodoxy and Orthodox parishes and peoples in Old Finland unchanged, whereas both the Lutheran Church and the Finnish Senate tried to transform it to correspond to that of Lutheranism in the rest of Finland.

Since the mid-1800s the situation gradually changed. Finnish-speaking Orthodox living close to Lutherans in the guberniya of Kuopio felt that they were disadvantaged relative to Lutherans, and started to demand services and education in their mother-tongue. They were at first supported by the Holy Synod. However, when nationalism gained momentum among the Finns and Russians, both parties realized that language demands had far-reaching implications, because through language Orthodoxy and the Finnish-speaking Orthodox in Finland could become a bridge for either Finnish or Russian nationalistic expansions.

The invention of nationalism as a political weapon does not explain everything. The point behind nationalistic rhetoric and controversies was administration. The Finnish Senate evidently did not comprehend the

differences in administrative practices (and, thus, also in economic functioning), when the guberniya of Vyborg was incorporated into Finland in 1812. Finnish authorities only gradually perceived that as long as the guberniya was administrated according to Russian legislative principles, its assimilation to Finland (which was what the Senate expected to happen) was impossible. Thus, around the early 1860s, the Senate systematically started to promulgate new statutes that incorporated the guberniya more and more closely to Finland. Russian authorities reacted late to criticize this; only after the 1880s did they fight back by starting to demand more space for Russian-language education and the Russian authorities in matters relative to parish administration and economics. Consequently, it was only natural to found a diocese of their own for Orthodox in Finland in 1892 and to attempt to achieve more and more independence, which the Finnish authorities, with a well-established legislative system and a strong hold on Finnish-speaking Orthodox, were not willing to allow.
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