

KARL BÜCHER IN DORPAT

Wolfgang Drechsler and Rainer Kattel¹

University of Tartu

Abstract. Karl Bücher (1847–1930), an eminent historical and anthropological economist and a founder of journalism as an academic discipline in Europe, held between 1882 and 1883 the Chair of Geography, Ethnography, and Statistics at the Imperial University of Dorpat (now Tartu). The present essay details especially the situation of the University during that time; the history of Bücher’s Chair, which is argued to be one of the most eminent at Dorpat, attracting internationally reputable scholars; the relations between Baltic Germans, Imperial Germans, Russians, and Estonians; the identity problem of the Baltic Germans in the context of both the German and the Russian nation state; and the language question (Russian vs. German) at the University. Particular consideration is given to the academic fights over two dissertations Bücher supervised and which were strongly criticized by the Baltic Germans, and to the Baltic German attitude towards the Estonian peasantry and Bücher’s analysis thereof. Finally, Bücher’s publications are discussed against the background of general Dorpat publishing habits at that time.

In 1882, the Munich *Privatdozent* Karl Bücher accepted a call to the Chair of Geography, Ethnography, and Statistics at the Imperial University of Dorpat in Livonia, one of the Baltic provinces of the Russian Empire. He occupied this ‘stepping-stone’ chair for distinguished German scholars for just three semesters (of which one was shortened), but these were very significant: “Extensive teaching, most beautiful domestic and most cordial collegial relations made the Dorpat period

¹ The research upon which this essay is based was funded by the Estonian Science Foundation (ETF), grant no. 3094. It was first presented at the 10th Heilbronn Symposium in Economics and Social Sciences, dedicated to Bücher on the occasion of his 150th birthday, on 29 June 1997. We would like to thank Jüri Allik for his support, vital as it is for social science scholarship in Estonia, Peter R. Senn, and Peeter Tulviste for their helpful criticism of the essay, Toomas Gross for his contribution to the research (a few expressions of his we have integrated unmarked), and the Heilbronn audience, especially Nicholas Balabkins, for questions and comments.

for Bücher the happiest one of his life.” (Skalweit 1946:7; see also Bücher 1919:292–293, 296) Aside from this importance for Bücher himself, his Dorpat years, accounted for in detail in perhaps the best autobiography of a Dorpat professor of that time, are an ideal in-road into a significant yet neglected chapter in German social science, and even University of Dorpat history. Finally, Bücher deals with the highly complicated and equally important subject of the relations of different ethnic groups in Estonia in a more sophisticated way, and perhaps more objectively, than anyone else. These three aspects gave cause to the present essay.

1. The University

The University of Dorpat had been founded in 1632 by King Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, to which Livonia then belonged. Struggling until 1710 and then closed, it was refounded in 1802 by order of the at that time reform-minded Emperor Alexander I. The language of instruction was German until 1893, when she was renamed Jurjev and teaching had to be in Russian. During this time, 1802–1893, Dorpat had a dual nature in that it belonged both into the set of German(-language) and Russian universities.² Financially and administratively, the latter was more important; intellectually and regarding the professoriate, the former. During Bücher’s time, there were thirty German-speaking universities, of which twenty-three were inside the German Empire, in Austro-Hungary five, in Switzerland two, and one – Dorpat – in Russia.³ Among these thirty universities, Dorpat was – by student numbers – the eleventh in size with 811 students. (Laspeyres 1876:21)⁴ And thus was the University perceived from Germany as well; as Hermann v. Helmholtz said in his inaugural lecture as Rector of the University of Berlin in 1877, „But now and even earlier, with passing exceptions, there was and is complete freedom of movement for the students between all universities of the German tongue, from Dorpat to Zurich, Vienna, and Graz.“ (Helmholtz 1896:201)

² Toivo Raun’s statement that the “most striking feature of the University during the first period was its German character” (1987:134) is thus somewhat amusing – intellectually, and as a university, this was a German institution. In Heilbronn, Nicholas Balabkins rightly pointed out that from the perspective of the Estonians, Dorpat had little impact on Estonian national higher education; however, it must be remembered that the purpose of the University since its refoundation had primarily been that of training civil servants and other professionals for the Russian Empire – not the education of the Estonians.

³ Figures for 1875/76, i.e. six years earlier; Laspeyres 1876.

⁴ Again, this number is for 1875/76. In Fall Term of 1882, there were altogether 1,366 students, of which 508 came from Livonia, 273 from Couronia, 136 from Estonia, 381 from other parts of Russia, 41 from Poland and 21 from the *Ausland*; *Neue Dörpt’sche Zeitung* [NDZ], 14 (26) September 1882 (on the twin date, see note 43 *infra*). According to L. Meyer, the student number more than tripled during the period from 1865 to 1890, from 594 to 1,812. (1900:7; see also G. Oettingen 1898:88)

According to the Dorpat professor Leo Meyer,⁵ the University had from 1802 to 1886, 209 professors (1887:6); 118 of these, more than a half, were from Germany,⁶ 64 from the Baltic Provinces; from other parts of Russian Empire came 22.⁷ (6) In the Fall Semester of 1882, there were altogether 41 ordinary professors, two extraordinary professors, one acting ordinary professor, one acting extraordinary professor, eight docents, two acting docents, one scientific pharmacist, two prosecutors, one observator and five *Privatdozenten*. (NDZ, 14 (26) September, 1882) 1882 was already late in the “flourishing-time” (Wittram 1964:67) or better “second flourishing” (Garleff 1987:148) of the University (differently Siilivask 1987:112), but the quality was still there.

However, Dorpat in the 1880s was mainly marked by the transition of the Russian Empire into a Nation State, which led to serious consequences for the Baltic Germans and for German(-language) higher education within what the Russians saw as simply another province of their country. Already in 1856, a year after Alexander II had ascended to the throne, a commission for the renewal of the statute of the University had been formed by the Ministry of National Education. It had been part of the general reform of the universities which took place in 1863. (Gernet 1902:85; Palamets 1982a:118) This was to be the last reform before Karl Bücher arrived and before the new statute of the University was established in 1884 (a year after Bücher left), which marked the beginning of Russification. The reform in Dorpat was initially carried out under the leadership of Curator Georg Friedrich v. Bradke (the Curator was the representative of the government at a university), and from 1862 onwards, by his successor, the eminent Count Alexander Keyserling.⁸

As Keyserling had emphasized in the last speech in the *Ritterschaft*⁹ before taking up his new position, “To either run ahead or to stay behind, in respect to our great Empire, means to pose the question wrongly. The one we cannot, the other we must not.”¹⁰ This quite adequately characterizes Keyserling’s policy as Curator: he was “too correct, too careful and too independent” to give in to the

⁵ Meyer held the Chair in Comparative Linguistics. In 1898, he left Tartu for Göttingen because of Russification. (L. Meyer 1900:8–9; Cederberg 1926–1929:320) The radical change in the student composition caused by Russification is drastically expressed by the number of students attending Meyer’s lectures during Spring Term 1897 – he had only one student. (L. Meyer 1900:7)

⁶ From those who came from Germany, 63 were from Prussia. (7; for a more detailed overview, see 7–19)

⁷ Five professors had once again a different background: two from Sweden, two from France and one from Switzerland. (7) Out of the 22 from other parts of Russian Empire, seven were actually of German origin. (18)

⁸ For an interesting biographical sketch of A. Keyserling, see L. Keyserling 1894.

⁹ The *Ritterschaft* (literally, Knighthood), a term coming from the Sword Brothers past, was the autonomous government of the Baltic Germans within the provinces. As the name says, this was a college of the enrolled aristocrats only.

¹⁰ Quoted in L. Keyserling 1894:27.

“party political” pressures of the Baltic Germans on the one hand (Petuhhov 1906:5); on the other hand, he was too much of a scholar to follow Imperial pressure for diminishing the independence of the University. (L. Keyserling 1894:28–29; Palamets 1982a:121) Keyserling’s main concern, however, was the international level of Dorpat scholarship. (See L. Keyserling 1894:29)¹¹ As he himself wrote in a letter to his friend Karl Ernst von Baer, the most eminent Baltic natural scientist of the century (cf. Käbin 1986:526–529), in 1864, “Our connections with nationality must withdraw ... the particularly Baltic-provincial does not belong to Dorpat – Dorpat must strive to become an international university”. (Keyserling 1902.1:475) This remained one of the dominating and hotly debated topics in Dorpat throughout the years to come – and it is one of the main questions in Tartu today as well.

The main virtue of the new statute, which came into power in 1865, was, as it seems, that it hardly changed anything (Petuhhov 1906:28; Gernet 1902:86–87); the academic independence of the University was preserved, and so it was still in 1882. (See Bücher 1919:311) The main emphasis of the Dorpat reform was changing the administrative structures in order “to rid the University from the chains”. (Gernet 1902:75) What this mainly meant was the freedom, or at least partial freedom, of the Rector from all kinds of instructions from above, that is from the Ministry of National Education. (75; Petuhhov 1906:28)

2. The Chair

The *Ordinariat* which Bücher was to fill was the Chair of Geography, Ethnography, and Statistics. The history of that chair is generally not accurately reported in the standard histories, especially the German-language ones, of the University themselves; it is thus outlined here in more detail than would have otherwise been necessary. We also briefly sketch out the background of Bücher’s predecessors, especially as this has not been done yet and as it casts the character of the chair in a new light.

¹¹ Cf. also L. Meyer 1900:6. The attempts to teach mathematics at Dorpat in Russian, in order to improve the Russian of the students, Keyserling resisted with the argument that he was fully aware that mathematics could be learned from the writings of Euclid, but that these very same writings could be used for the Greek lesson was new to him. (See L. Keyserling 1894:29)

There are two quite different stories as to why Keyserling in 1869 was dismissed by the Ministry from the position of Curator. Palamets argues, telling the story how it has become known that Keyserling was dismissed because his inability to deal with the problem of “separatists” like Carl Schirren. (1982a:121) Leo Keyserling has quite another story, *viz.* that in 1869 the governor of Estonia, Stalkin, on the order of Prince Suvorov from 1853, decreed that all the teachers at Reval should attend the Orthodox church (instead of the Lutheran one) during the coronation festivities. Keyserling, being in charge of the *Lehrbezirk* (teaching district), refused. And when the officials insisted, Keyserling resigned. (1894:30–31)

According to the "Plan of the University" of 1799, there was supposed to be a Chair of "General History and Geography, especially Russian" and another one of "Economics, Cameral Sciences, Statistics and Forestry", both in the Faculty of Philosophy. (Malmberg 1903:327) With the statute of 1803, two quite similar chairs were indeed established: first, the Chair of "General History, Statistics and Geography"; second, the Chair of "History, Statistics and Geography of the Russian State, especially of Livonia, Estonia, Couronia and Finland".¹² (1903:338)

In the Statute of 1820, the first chair was renamed "Historical Sciences", and the second one "Statistical and Geographical Sciences" (and thus did no longer include History; 339). From 1850, the latter chair belonged to the Historical-Philological Faculty. (1903:330; Gernet 1902:75) Since 1865, it was called the Chair of Geography, Ethnography, and Statistics (Malmberg 1903:331; Gernet 1902:89; Bücher 1919:295; also Graß 1967:2), as it stayed until the end of the German University of Dorpat.¹³

Since the 1865 renaming of the chair, the focus of the chair was statistics; Bücher at one point even refers to a chair for statistics only (1919:273), although the full name is given by him correctly as well. (295) He also recalls that his predecessors had neither taught, nor were expected to teach, the first two disciplines of the chair's name. (295; see Graß 1967:3) And it turned out that – with the exception of one class which Bücher had inherited from his predecessor – indeed all that Bücher taught at Dorpat was statistics.

The holders of the chair were, chronologically, as follows:

- | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. 1803–1810 | Adam Christian Gaspari | (1752 Schleisingen – 1830 Königsberg) |
| 2. 1810–1826 | Gustav (v.) Ewers | (1781 Amelunxen/Wesen – 1830 Dorpat) |
| 3. 1826–1851 | Karl Ludwig Blum | (1796 Hanau – 1869 Heidelberg) |
| 4. 1856/58–1863 | Carl Schirren | (1826 Riga – 1910 Kiel) |
| 5. 1865–1868 | Adolph Wagner | (1835 Erlangen – 1917 Berlin) |
| 6. 1869–1873 | Etienne Laspeyres | (1834 Halle/Saale – 1913 Gießen) |
| 7. 1874–1876 | Wilhelm Lexis | (1837 Eschweiler – 1914 Göttingen) |
| 8. 1877/79–1882 | Wilhelm Stieda | (1852 Riga – 1933 Leipzig) |
| 9. 1882–1883 | Karl Bücher | (1847 Kirberg – 1930 Leipzig) |
| 10. 1884–1909 | Joh. Richard Mucke | (1846 Pirna – 1909 Jurjev) |

Among the occupants of the chair, the standard German histories of Dorpat tend to emphasize Schirren, Ewers and Wagner; Lexis, Bücher, and Stieda are usually mentioned as well.¹⁴

¹² The statute of 1813 did not change the names or structure of these chairs. (Malmberg 1903:328)

¹³ For the history of the chair, see also Gernet 1902:8-9, 22, 42–44, 75, 89; A. Keyserling 1866:104–110. A later biographical sketch of Bücher's mistakenly calls the chair one of "Staatswissenschaften"; Lotz 1931.

¹⁴ G. Oettingen lists the professors who in his opinion were on an internationally high level during the 1860s–70s; from the "Economics Faculty" he mentions Wagner, Laspeyres, Lexis and Dietzel. (1898:87)

2.1. Adam Christian Gaspari

Adam Christian Gaspari, the first holder of the chair (Masing et al. 1918:116; see also Graß 1967:3; Malmberg 1903:339; Engelhardt 1931:190),¹⁵ had been among the first faculty members to join Dorpat after the refoundation in 1802. (Engelhardt 1933:45) Gaspari had become an extraordinary professor of philosophy in Jena in 1795 and professor at the Oldenburg *Gymnasium* in 1797. He had come to the Dorpat chair in 1803. Between 1804 and 1805, he served as the University's third Rector. In 1810, he accepted a call to the corresponding chair (of Geography and Statistics) at the University of Königsberg, where he remained. (Ratzel 1878) Gaspari was particularly successful with works for a wider audience (1878), but his oeuvre is generally impressive, and he was no mean first occupant of the chair. We find "Statistical Tables on the Most Important European States" in 1778, a "Complete Handbook of the Newest Descriptions of the Earth" first in two volumes 1797–1802, then in five volumes, with others, 1819–1826; a "General Yearbook of Statistics for the Year 1800", and various distinguished editorships (1878), including, together with F. J. Bertuch, volumes 5–11 of the *Allgemeine Geographische Ephemeriden*. (1800–1803) In one of the German histories of Dorpat, it is reported that Gaspari had "merits for the method of the geographic-statistical teaching" (Masing et al. 1918:116; see also Ratzel 1878) as well.

2.2. Gustav (v.) Ewers

Gustav Ewers was a farmer's son from Westphalia who had studied first Divinity and then *Staatswissenschaften* in Göttingen, had spent some time as a private tutor which had brought him to Livonia, and had meanwhile pursued his scholarly interests, especially regarding Russian political and legal history, which became one of his main fields.¹⁶ (Engelhardt 1933:72–73; Semel 1918:17–18) Ewers received the call to the Chair of History, Statistics, and Geography of the Russian State etc. in early 1810. (Engelhardt 1933:72)¹⁷ He occupied it until in

¹⁵ Gaspari's position is often referred to as the Chair of Russian History (e.g. A. Keyserling 1866:104–105; Engelhardt 1933:190; Mucke 1903a does not see Gaspari as his predecessor either), and the same confusion often exists concerning Ewers' position before he crossed over to the Faculty of Law (see *infra*). However, as A. Keyserling explains, up to the 1820s Statistics and Geography were to a large extent connected, by substance as well as structurally, with Russian History. (1866:108) And as Leo Meyer clearly says, Gaspari had the Chair of "History of the Russian-Land or, as it then was called, of the History, Statistics, and Geograpy of the Russian Empire and [*sic!*] of *Liv-, Est-, Kur- und Finland*". (1887:7)

¹⁶ For Ewers' biography and scholarly career see Djakonov 1903:510–537; for his importance for Russian Legal History, Semeljanova 1987; see also Lotman 1958:131–132 and Bertram 1868:5–11.

¹⁷ Engelhardt claims that between 1820 and 1826, Ewers taught statistics (1933:191); this is probably a misprint and he means 1810. Masing et al. 1918:116 n. 1, say that Ewers, because of vacancies for several years, also taught statistics until 1826; this must be a misunderstanding because after all, statistics was part of his chair.

1826 (Engelhardt 1933:72, 194; Malmberg 1903:339), he transferred to the Law Faculty. In 1816, he declined a call to the Chair of *Staatswirtschaft* (state management) at the newly-founded University of Berlin. (Engelhardt 1933:72) In the same year, he had become Prorector; in 1818, Rector, to which he was re-elected every year until his death in 1830. Some of his letters were edited and published by his successor on the chair, Wilhelm Stieda. (Stieda 1926:60–69)

2.3. Karl Ludwig Blum

After the renaming of the chair in 1820 to “Chair of Statistical and Geographical Sciences”, the first holder was Karl Ludwig Blum, who held it for 25 years, between 1826–1851. (Mucke 1903a:589)¹⁸ Blum, by training both a lawyer and a Ph.D. in Classics from Berlin, where he had served as *Privatdozent*, was also quite a well-known poet. (L. 1875:738) He was mainly interested in Classics and later also in Russian and Livonian history. (Masing et al. 1918:119) Among his Classics publications are a short but fine *Einleitung in Rom’s alte Geschichte* (1828; L. 1875:738) and a book on Herodotus and Ktesias. (738)¹⁹ He was an editor of the *Dorpater Jahrbücher für Litteratur, Statistik und Kunst* in 1833, which do not seem to have survived the efforts of the censorship office. Blum also was the author of important historical studies of 18th century Russia and Livonia. (L. 1875:738–739) “The stay in Russia, for which Blum’s liberal and frank nature was hardly made,” and domestic catastrophes made Blum retire after 25 years to Heidelberg, where he died in 1869 through an accident. (L.:739)

The chair remained vacant between 1851 and 1856. During 1852–53, its lectures were given by a Lecturer of English, the Dane John Jakob Dede. (Mucke 1903a:590) During the first semester of 1855, Geography was taught by a *Privatdozent*, Richard Wendt. (590; Malmberg 1903:339).²⁰

2.4. Carl Schirren

Carl Schirren, a Balt from Riga who had obtained all his degrees at Tartu, was by trade also a historian, specializing as Blum had in Livonian history, although his Ph.D. thesis was on New Zealand aborigines’ myths. (Engelhardt 1933:326–327) After heading a private boys’ school, he became *Privatdozent* at the chair in

¹⁸ Not until 1861, as Graß (1967:3) and Masing et al. (1918:119) say.

¹⁹ Graß calls him “mostly a Geographer” (1967:3) – both judging from his writings and considering the fact that nominally, Geography was the principal field of the chair, this is an odd remark.

²⁰ When Engelhardt claims that the chair then remained unoccupied, not counting two Russian ‘interim’ lecturers, after Ewers’ leaving for over thirty years (1933:191), this seems to be a mix-up with the History chair, by then separate (see Masing et al. 1918:116), and the five-year hiatus between Blum and Schirren.

1856. (Malmberg 1903:339; Mucke 1903a:591) In 1858,²¹ he was regularly elected to the chair. (See Masing et al. 1918:117) In 1863, he moved to the Chair of Russian History. (Mucke 1903a:591; Masing et al. 1918:117) This was more in line with his interests (see Vasar 1927:esp. 5), although he is also credited with having done “without any doubt more than anyone of his predecessors at this chair” (Mucke 1903a:591) and (albeit wrongly) with being the first one to teach and research in fields that were named in the title of the chair. (Mucke 1903a:591) He is even said to have been an eminent statistician – “by first stepping over the limits of Achenwall’s statistics and to questions of a geographic-ethnographic and statistical nature.” (Masing et al. 1918:120)

Famous as an excellent and popular teacher (Engelhardt 1933:327–328), he was also founder and editor of a liberal newspaper. As a historian, Schirren was self-taught and had few followers, and the comparison with Treitschke, Ranke, and Mommsen, of which one occasionally reads (Wittram 1964:118), overstates the case. He is said to have been “an agnostic and a radical pessimist who refused the Christian religion as the supreme of illusions.” (69; cf. Engelhardt 1933:335) From radical democrat, he had fairly early in life changed to Conservative (323), which stands somewhat in contrast with his agnosticism – not with his pessimism, of course, which is a basis of Conservatism.²²

Schirren is by far the best-know holder of the Statistics chair in German Baltic history, but not because of any scholarly accomplishments. He was dismissed in

²¹ Not in 1860 or 1863, as Engelhardt says. (1933:191)

²² Schirren’s essay on Machiavelli (1878), based on his inaugural lecture as Rector of the University of Kiel, is today perhaps the most interesting piece he wrote. He is very close in his interpretation to an only apparently odd quadriga: Carl Schmitt, Max Weber, Thomas Hobbes, and, most importantly, Friedrich Nietzsche. (Cf. also Wittram 1964:69; Engelhardt 1933:336) In a German history of Dorpat, it is claimed that the “over-rich Machiavelli-literature does not possess, as far as I know, an even approximately so magnificent second picture of the Florentine state secretary than the one drawn in shakingly magnificent ways by Schirren ..., so that next to it Macauley’s famous essay pales completely.” (Masing et al. 1918:177 note 3) To those who want to clear Machiavelli’s reputation by giving Italian independence as a reason for his toughness (Schirren 1878:15–16), Schirren says:

But do we really need an address to understand it? Is it vital to check immortal teachings on a personal foil? Does the Principe really accost us as the child of some time, some brain, as infernal ideal, as something extraordinary, as something monstrous? Or does he not just display himself as his own image, as he is, as he can’t be otherwise, as he will be until the end of time?

All truth, all past bears witness for him.

As Machiavelli has stamped him, he has ruled the world. Look wherever you want: he accosts you wherever a people loses its freedom. (16)

Schirren finishes anthropologically, pointing out that the *Principe* is Man as such, and that those who cannot bear looking at the truth may of course look elsewhere, but they will fool themselves by listening to those meaning-giving theoreticians, while beyond and above them all, the world goes on as Machiavelli describes it. (17–18) In sum, Schirren’s Machiavelli represents the late-20th century majority view. (See Mansfield 1985:vii–viii)

1869 for his famous *Livländische Antwort* (1869b), a reply to *Okrainy rossii* (1868), a pamphlet by the Russian slavophile politician and intellectual Juri F. Samarin who had called for the radical Russification of the Baltic provinces. (See Engelhardt 1933:330; Masing et al. 1918:118; Schwabe 1915:72–73)²³

After his dismissal, Schirren was up for a chair at Breslau, then part of Prussia, but this was denied because Breslau was too close to Russia. Prussia at that time did not desire any conflict with Russia and Bismarck, while personally sympathetic to the Baltic barons, did not appreciate their pan-germanic movement, as this was disruptive to his own plans. (See Rothfels 1930:238–239; 1960:34–44; Engelhardt 1933:320; cf. also Wagner 1866b)²⁴ In 1874, Schirren finally received a call to Kiel, also in Prussia but farther away, where he became Professor of History, chair of the Department, and in 1878 even Rector. He retired in 1907 and died three years later.

2.5. Adolph Wagner

For the three semesters after Schirren moved to the Chair of Russian History, the Statistics chair was unoccupied (Mucke 1903a:592) until Adolph Wagner, its most distinguished holder was elected.²⁵ Apparently, Karl Ernst v. Baer had tried to lobby with Curator Count Keyserling to get the chair for one his acquaintances (or friends) by the name of Schlaginweit. However, as Keyserling explained in his reply, not only was the chair already filled and v. Baer too late with his intervention, it was also a chair which “can be conceived here only from the ‘state science’ point of view, not from the physical one”. (Keyserling 1902.1:477) Half a year later, he mentions in a letter to Bernhard von Uexküll that “Prof. Adolph Wagner is a brilliant acquisition.” (483)²⁶

²³ Schirren had indeed never been a Russophile, lecturing, for instance, about *Russische Geschichten* rather than *Russische Geschichte* – Russian Stories rather than Russian History. (Masing et al. 1918:117) Of course, the main reason for Samarin’s book was exactly the kind of attitude Schirren embodied. (See Samarin 1868:2–9)

²⁴ In this essay, Wagner notes that Russia’s anti-Prussian attitude at that time was based on the fear that the Russian Baltic provinces might gravitate to Prussia the more heavily the stronger Prussia became. (See also Wagner to the editors of the *Preußische Jahrbücher*, 16 July 1866, in Wagner 1978:43–46, 43)

²⁵ Wittram, in his essay on Dorpat in the 19th century, states that “Between 1865 and 1868, Adolf Wagner, the *Kathedersozialist*, was professor of *Nationalökonomie* in Dorpat” and says he was succeeded by Mithoff and Dietzel. (1964:74) In this already cavalier sentence, about the only accurate part is the period; Wittram is able to combine the amazing number of four mistakes (misspelled first name, *Katheders-* instead of *Staatssozialist*, wrong teaching area, wrong successors) – probably record for Dorpat historiography, and regarding the most eminent economist ever at this university at that.

²⁶ However, Keyserling apparently did not share the world-view Wagner represented, since 16 years later, he says, again in a letter to Bernhard v. Uexküll, that “I am of course not on the side of the State- and Kathedersocialisten”. (1902.2:245)

For Adolph Wagner, Dorpat was the first regular university chair. He is particularly interesting in this context because his and Bücher's Dorpat times are as comparable as their personalities and later careers, although Wagner stayed about twice as long in Livonia. Both had met in 1874 at the *Verein für Socialpolitik*'s meeting (Bücher 1919:194) and had become friends. But Wagner was born on 25 March 1835 in Erlangen, as the son of a university professor, the physiologist Rudolf Wagner. He had studied economics at the University of Göttingen, receiving a doctorate in 1857. Adolph Wagner's academic career had taken him first to the Merchants' Superior School, Vienna (1858–1863), then – after failing to secure a chair at the University of Vienna because of disagreements over fiscal policy with Lorenz von Stein – to the Hamburg Higher Merchants' School (1863–1865), both institutions comparable to business schools today. By accepting the call to Dorpat in 1865,²⁷ Wagner more than doubled his salary. (See Wagner's own list of income of late 1868, in Wagner 1978:66)

Wagner was happy in Dorpat, "our remote but pleasant little town – the Baltic Heidelberg, as the locals euphemistically call it." (Wagner to Johann Kaspar Bluntschli, 2 October 1865, in Wagner 1978:39–40, 40; cf. Schwabe 1915:12; Garleff 1987:144)²⁸ As Adolph's first wife Johanna, who died during her husband's Baltic time and is buried in Tartu, had written to her brother-in-law Hermann on 13 April 1866, "If one only could transfer Dorpat at once to the South." (42–43, 42; see also Schwabe 1915:68) It has been said "that the Dorpat tenure for several years had essential significance for *Adolph Wagner's* later scholarly and political activities." (Stucken in Graß 1967:1)

Wagner's stay in Dorpat is also important in social science history because of his meeting with the theologian Alexander v. Oettingen, who at that time was Professor of Dogmatics. Wagner's first major statistical work, published a year before his coming to Dorpat (1864), with its claim of a sort of moral determinism (Graß' point that Wagner was not really an eminent statistician is entirely without foundation; 1967:3; cf. also Hanel 1997:537 n. 41), was of great importance for Oettingen. It contributed, as a counter-picture, to his seminal work *Die Moralstatistik* (1868; Engelhardt 1933:258), a topic about which he also lectured with the greatest success. (516; Girgensohn in Semel 1918:164) Oettingen makes the point that there is regularity in human action because of human societal living together but that there is freedom of action of the individual "because the regularity of moral statistical numbers is never absolute". (Engelhardt 1933:258; see also 262–266, 400–401, 455; Girgensohn in Semel 1918:44) Oettingen pays great and impressive respect to Wagner as a friend yet scholarly opponent in the preface of the *Moralstatistik* (1868:vii–viii) and has a separate chapter on him. (203–216)

²⁷ Not, as Stucken (in Graß 1967:1) says, 1864.

²⁸ Similarly, Roos calls St. Petersburg and Tartu (meaning Dorpat) the "Yale and Harvard of the Czarist Empire." (1985:56)

Still, or so it has been argued, Wagner “became a follower of Bismarck’s policy for unifying Germany under Prussian guidance.” (Rubner in Wagner 1978:435)²⁹ His friend and colleague, the Classicist Ludwig Schwabe,³⁰ puts this anecdotally in more certain terms and tells the story that Wagner even named his newborn son Bismarck (which later was changed first to Bismar and then to Friedrich; 1915:68). Thus, when German unification became realistic, Wagner wanted to go back to Germany proper – a general attitude of Imperial Germans in the Baltics. (See 1915:76) Beginning Fall Term 1868/69, Wagner therefore took over the Chair of the Cameralistic subjects (roughly, “state management”; Backhaus and Wagner 1987:6–7)³¹ at the Grand Duke of Badenian University of Freiburg im Breisgau,³² and very soon afterwards, in 1870, the Chair of *Staatswissenschaften* at the University of Berlin, by that time (rather than in Ewers’) not the premier university only in Germany but probably in the world. Wagner died in Berlin in 1917 as one of the intellectually and politically most influential economists of his time.³³ It is said from the German Baltic side that “he preserved for our *Land*³⁴ a warm memory and has proven that in a difficult hour” (Masing et al. 1918:120), but we have not found Wagner’s statements to which this might refer.³⁵

²⁹ Rubner says that this happened under the influence of “the milieu of the conservative society of German Dorpat” (in Wagner 1978:435), but this would be in a way ironic.

³⁰ Incidentally misspelt as “Schwalbe” in Masing et al. 1918:100.

³¹ On Cameralism most interesting Bücher himself in 1903a:12–13.

³² When in Freiburg, Wagner complained about the lack of “that wonderful Russian heating system”; letter to Hermann Wagner, 24/25 December 1868, in Wagner 1978:67–68, 67.

³³ Wagner conceived the theory of *Staatssozialismus*, State Socialism, a unique, reformist political-economic theory which eventually, at least in parts, became the underlying creed of much government economic and social policy in the German Empire. In the late 1890s, Wagner influenced the new social and economic policy of Chancellor Bernhard Prince Bülow; his ideas were at the basis of the German taxation reform of the 1900s. On Wagner’s relevance today, see Drechsler 1997 and generally Backhaus 1997, but also Heilmann 1980 and Wright 1993. On his State Socialism see very briefly Drechsler 1995a; more thoroughly Wagner 1887=1947 and 1895.

³⁴ The term *Land*, which in German can refer to ‘country’ in both meanings (i.e., as opposed to city and as state/nation), has a special significance in Baltic German: it signifies the sphere of autonomous administration by the Baltic Germans, i.e. the sphere between personal and family matters on the one side and the Russian government and nation on the other. (See Semel 1918:165) This is not possible to bring out in English, so it remains untranslated.

³⁵ A discussion of Wagner’s publications during his Dorpat times, and a comparison to those of Bücher, is to be found *infra*.

2.6. Etienne Laspeyres

After Wagner's leave, the occupant of the sister chair,³⁶ Theodor Graß, had been looking for a professional younger Christian statistician. (Graß 1967:4–5) The man who was called was Etienne Laspeyres (1834–1913), an Imperial German who however had just previously been professor at the Riga Polytechnic. Laspeyres held the chair between 1869 and 1873.³⁷ Bücher mentions him as one of his more distinguished predecessors (with Wagner and Lexis; Bücher 1919:280). He had met Laspeyres, “whose name I knew very well”, at the 1875 *Volkswirtschaftliche Kongreß* in Munich. (196) Laspeyres, who held both a legal and a philosophical doctorate, had previously been *Docent der Nationalökonomie und Staatswissenschaften* (roughly, of economics and ‘state sciences’; Laspeyres 1863, cover) at the University of Heidelberg; he had been professor in Basel before coming to Riga and later became Professor of Economics in Karlsruhe and finally Gießen. (Bücher 1919:196; Schwabe 1915:69; *Meyers...* 1906) Among Laspeyres' early works are the 11th Prince Jablonowski Society prize essay, a book-length and still very substantial work on the economic theories prevalent in the Netherlands during their Republican times. (1863) But Laspeyres was also interested, and today is considered not without significance, in Statistics. One of his works which features Dorpat is highly interesting for academic history as well as useful in this context, an investigation of the age structure of the German professoriate. (1876)

2.7. Wilhelm Lexis

Laspeyres' successor Wilhelm Lexis, the son of a physician, held a Ph.D. in Physics and was, like Bücher, a former *Gymnasium* teacher and journalist. (Koch 1983:421) Before accepting the Dorpat chair, he had in 1872–1874 been extraordinary professor at the newly-founded University of Straßburg. In the year he left, Lexis received an honorary doctorate in economics (Dr.rer.pol.) from Dorpat; in 1898, a Russian decoration (the Stanislaus Order 1st Class; Esenwein-Rothe 1992:61). Next to his very important inaugural lecture (1997; see Drechsler

³⁶ The Chair of Cameralistics, Public Finance and Trade, after 1865 of Political Economy (Mucke 1903b:610–611), was first held by Eduard Friedländer, 1828–1856 (Masing et al. 1918:120; Engelhardt 1933:191, 402); then by the Balt Theodor Graß, 1857–1872 (402–403, Masing et al. 1918:120); during Bücher's time by Theodor K. Mithoff, 1873–1884 (see note 44 *infra*), and afterwards by the eminent Heinrich Dietzel, 1885–1890. (See Engelhardt 1933:405–406)

³⁷ Laspeyres' appointment is not mentioned at all in the German Dorpat literature; it is, however, documented in Mucke (1903a:594–595) and Malmberg (1903:339), both being Russian-language sources. This is strange, because Laspeyres was not a minor figure, and his Dorpat time was quite substantial. Interestingly and quite inexplicably, he is the only holder of the chair honored with a portrait (but no description) in the 1982 historical picture-book published on occasion of the 350th anniversary of the University. (*Alma mater tartuensis* 1982:105, no. 285)

forthcoming), his main Dorpat publication seems to have been the demographic essay, “Die Geschlechtsverhältnisse der Geborenen und die Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung” in the *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik*. (1876) Exactly like Wagner, Lexis went from Dorpat, where he stayed for two years, 1874–1876, to the economics chair at Freiburg im Breisgau, from there in 1884 to Breslau and in 1887 to Göttingen, which was his final appointment. (Koch 1983:421)

Although the author of an *Allgemeine Volkswirtschaftslehre* (1910) and certainly a distinguished economist, even a pioneer of Law and Economics thinking and of the study of consumption and crises (see Esenwein-Rothe 1992:37, 42–46), Lexis is perhaps the one holder of the chair who is primarily known as a statistician and particularly as a demographer. (See 16–31) A *Kathedersozialist* as well, he is also one of the founding fathers of the interdisciplinary, professional study of insurance. (Koch 1983:421) He was closely affiliated with academic policy makers in Prussia and the editor of important works on German higher education. (421–422)

2.8. Wilhelm Stieda

Wilhelm Stieda, Bücher’s immediate predecessor and actually a few years younger, was a Baltic German, but he had studied in Berlin, Paris, and Straßburg, where in 1876 he became *Privatdozent*. Stieda moved to Dorpat and to the Chair of Statistics in December of 1877, but he did not right away receive the *Ordinariat*, but spent one year as extraordinary professor. Only in 1879 did he attain the chair. (Mucke 1903a:597–598; *Wer ist’s?* 1928:1525)³⁸ His international referees were his predecessor Lexis and Gustav Schmoller.³⁹ In 1882, Stieda accepted a position in Germany, at the Imperial Statistical Office. (Bücher 1919:280). He rejoined academia shortly after that by accepting a call to a chair at Rostock in 1884, and in 1898 he actually became a colleague of Bücher’s by moving to the latter’s sister chair at the University of Leipzig. (*Wer ist’s?* 1928:1525) Stieda was a strong supporter of German Dorpat and its culture (Stieda 1915:vi); he also dealt with its history in various publications. (See 1926) An expert in economic history, especially trade, Stieda authored a still very interesting history of economics as a university discipline. (1906; bibliography in *Wer ist’s?* 1928:1525–1526)

³⁸ Mucke says that Stieda was elected full professor in 1889, which must be a misprint. (1903a:597–598)

³⁹ Lexis’ and Schmoller’s letters on behalf of Stieda are lost; only the summaries in the German version of the presentation letter to the University Council by the Faculty of Historical-Philological Sciences remain. (Estonian History Archives, fond 402, list 3, file 1605, p. 12t.)

2.9. Johannes Richard Mucke

Jumping ahead of the present story, the last German occupant of the chair is mentioned here also, Richard Mucke, Bücher's successor in 1884 and the final German occupant of the chair until 1909, when Dorpat had already become Jurjev. Mucke had been extraordinary professor at Greifswald. (Bücher 1919:319) He was elected on Bücher's recommendation (1919:319), because at Dorpat this was traditionally an obligation of a leaving chair. (318) Mucke's election was not without problems, because there were intrigues against him from the outside, which however, Bücher states, the Dorpat colleagues understood as normal and thus did not mind. (319) Bücher reports that there were few good and appropriate statisticians in Germany, but that many men tried to get the position – most of them quite unqualified. (1919:318–319)

Some former colleagues later called Mucke “a highly original personality ... who everywhere gave his own, highly strange opinions, about the value of which, or complete valuelessness, probably only the future will be able to decide.” (Masing et al. 1918:120) Be that as it may, Mucke's publications, although he is certainly no major figure, include empirically valuable books on the German customs union (1869), on compulsory accident insurance (1881), and a sizable tome on Germany's grain production. (1884) Mucke had a serious interest in statistics as well, and his theoretical reflections here do not seem to be without merit; especially noteworthy is his *Das historische Princip der Statistik, gegenüber Georg von Mayr's Begriff der Statistik als Wissenschaft von den sozialen Massen*. (1900) But Mucke already accepted the call when Russification was written on the wall, and it appears that he was not able to receive a call back to the German Empire but rather stayed on in Jurjev.

The Chair of Geography, Ethnography and Statistics was one of the most eminently occupied in the history of the University of Dorpat, attracting consecutively several internationally reputable scholars. The succession of holders from 1865 to 1883, without any interruption, also forms a veritable *Who's Who?* of perhaps half of the main protagonists of that key German political-societal-economic theory of the late 19th century, State- and *Kathedersozialismus*: Wagner, Laspeyres, Lexis, Stieda, Bücher. If the Chair's history has been ill- or almost not documented compared to others at Dorpat, especially to some in the ever-praised medical and natural sciences faculties (cf. Wittram 1964:73–74, Siilivask 1987:112–113, Roos 1985:56; Käbin 1986, *passim*, esp. 27; also Semel 1918; Engelhardt 1933), then this is merely indicative of a general bias of both the Baltic German and the Estonian academic historians.

Most holders of the Chair of Statistics were there early in their career, and many stayed but briefly. The occupation of the chair switched frequently between

1851 and 1884 (Masing et al. 1918:119), which is however not only negative,⁴⁰ but it seems to be the price one has to pay anywhere for quality if one is situated in a remote location. This was well-known; Dorpat on purpose searched for younger excellent scholars who might not yet have gained a chair in the Empire. (Graß 1967:5) It should also be pointed out that, while nobody came from another University chair, all occupants of the chair (excepting Schirren) had their doctorate or the *Habilitation* from Imperial German universities. Most had also been extraordinary professors, *Dozenten*, or *Privatdozenten* there.⁴¹ Bücher says that the examples of his illustrious predecessors, who had all returned home and to better positions, were a good model for him, once he had to go through a “pre-heating period before being found worthy of an Imperial German university.” (1919:280)

And indeed, every single holder of the chair during Dorpat times (with the exception, as far as we know, of the retiring Blum), Balt or Imperial German, accepted or received at least one formal call to a chair in Imperial Germany either directly or later in his career.⁴² This is an indication of high quality, even by Imperial German standards – and by today’s ones as well.

3. The Call

Bücher had received the call to the Dorpat chair together with one to an extraordinary professorship at the University of Erlangen. He had been “initially not very inclined” to accept Dorpat, but the Bavarian ministry opted against the unanimous suggestion by the Erlangen faculty in his favor, and so he accepted Dorpat instead. (Bücher 1919:273) This means that Bücher would have preferred a more junior appointment at a quite minor German university over the chair in Dorpat, but this was perhaps only subjective – the Bavarian university department

⁴⁰ As Leo Meyer argued in 1886: “Calls from our University have in general steadily increased in number; at any rate an indication that one was certainly capable here to select truly competent lecturers, but on the other hand regrettably also of the fact that we frequently lacked the means to keep them.” (1887:4)

⁴¹ Gaspari, Lexis, and Mucke had been extraordinary professors at Jena, Straßburg, and Greifswald, respectively; Blum, Laspeyres, Stieda, and Bücher (*Privat-Dozenten*) at Berlin, Heidelberg, Straßburg, and Munich, respectively; Ewers and Wagner were both Göttingen Ph.D.s, and Wagner had taught as regular professor, but at sub-university institutions. Laspeyres had been professor in Switzerland (Basel) and at the Riga Polytechnic.

⁴² Gaspari to Königsberg, Ewers to Berlin (not accepted), Schirren to Kiel, Wagner to Freiburg i.Br. and Berlin, Laspeyres to Gießen, Lexis to Freiburg i.Br., Breslau, and Göttingen, Stieda to Rostock and Leipzig, Bücher to Leipzig. Manteuffel lists 59 professors of the University of Dorpat (between 1803 and 1889) who accepted a call to some other foreign (not Russian, and not only German) university, but his list is incomplete (it does not include, e.g., Bücher and Kraepelin; 1898:81[–82], note 1.) According to Engelhardt, until 1890, 39 Dorpat-educated academics had received a professorship in Germany. (1933:452)

head in the ministry saw it, if cynically, somehow otherwise. (273) And anyway, “Dorpat – similar to the small Swiss universities – was known as the first step of an academic career.” (280; the Swiss ones being Zürich and Basel.)

Bücher had heard already in April 1882 that he was being considered for the Dorpat chair. (280) But only on 10 (28) May⁴³ 1882 did the Historical-Philological Faculty unanimously vote to propose him to the University Council. (281) Two days later, the Dean of the Faculty, the economist and holder of the sister chair, Theodor K. Mithoff, did so.⁴⁴ Mithoff says that Karl Bücher was “a very able scholar” and that his publications are “excellent in their multisidedness.”⁴⁵ He then quotes the opinions of Bücher’s international referees, first Adolph Wagner, who considers Bücher to be most worthy of the professorship and underlines especially Büchers educatedness;⁴⁶ second Johann v. Helferich, the Munich *Ordinarius* to whose chair Bücher had been attached as *Privatdozent*, who draws attention to Bücher’s many academic abilities.⁴⁷ On this basis, the Council elected Bücher on 21 May (2 June).⁴⁸ However, as Stieda had not formally left yet, which happened on 1 (13) July, Bücher could only then be presented to the Curator, and on 13 (25) July, Bücher was confirmed by the Ministry in St. Petersburg. (281)

Bücher’s call had been a genuine one, i.e. he had neither applied nor even indicated interest, but he had been recruited – on the basis of careful investigation, of course. (280–281) What had drawn Dorpat’s attention to Bücher is not clear. We know that when looking for Wagner’s replacement, Graß had asked Helferich whether Schäffle might be able to recommend someone. (1967:6) Graß was dead by the time of Bücher’s call, but we can speculate that if this link was formed and

⁴³ Since at this time Russia had not yet adopted the Western calendar, important days are, as customary, given first in Russian and then, in parenthesis, in Western style.

⁴⁴ Estonian History Archives, fond 402, list 3, file 231, pp. 4–8t (in German and Russian).

Mithoff, who studied at Göttingen, Berlin and Paris, first mathematics and later political economy, was called to Dorpat in 1873, but he only started teaching the following semester, with an inaugural lecture on *Kathedersocialismus* (1874; see Mucke 1903b:610–611), which unfortunately was mostly descriptive. He was Bücher’s Dean during the entire time the latter was in Dorpat. (Cf. Bücher 1919:294) Stieda and Mithoff had not gotten along well. Mithoff resigned soon after Bücher from Dorpat to run for a state senate (*Landtag*) seat in Prussia. (294) He also seems to have been a member of the Imperial Parliament. (*Reichstag*; Engelhardt 1933:405) Bücher says that Mithoff died before he had acclimatized in Germany. (1919:294) In Bücher’s judgement, Mithoff was neither a great nor original scholar, but a competent university teacher well capable of summarizing and displaying the teachings of his time. (294–295) Engelhardt reports that he “belonged to that group of Imperial German professors who, thanks to their historical-conservative point of view, soon grew into the Dorpat atmosphere and who loyally stood by Baltdom and its tasks.” (1933:405)

⁴⁵ Estonian History Archives, fond 402, list 3, file 231, p. 7t.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8t.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

remained intact, then Schäffle and/or Helferich might have very easily recommended Bücher, and so would have Wagner himself.

There had been voices against the call because of his Liberalism, but Bücher says that the Dorpat reply had been, “If this man has been with the ‘Frankfurter Zeitung’, then he must have courage, and this is precisely what we need.” (Bücher 1919:281) This is by no means ordinary for this time, but it must be based on the fact that the people who filled the vacancy were living in a climate of steady resistance against the government, dissimilar to most other German-speaking universities at that time; the year of the call – 1882 – is also the first one of the first phase of Russification. As Bücher said, “the question of ‘Russification’ did already play a large role.” (304) Thus, an antagonistically-minded professor was welcome.

And this appointment was possible, because in Dorpat – unheard of in Germany, and the reason why Bücher had been unable to go to Erlangen – , professors were elected by the University Council (consisting of all chaired and extraordinary professors), “approval by the ministry was a mere formality.” (281; see 303-304)⁴⁹

4. In Dorpat

4.1. Arrival and Life

With the Dorpat contract in his pocket, Bücher had married Emilie Mittermaier, the daughter of the Grand Ducal Badenian *Baurat* Philipp Mittermaier, himself the son of a Heidelberg law professor. (273–276) Bücher and his wife left for Dorpat on 27 August, the day after his wedding. (283) They took the train to Lübeck and from there a Finnish steamer to Reval, continuing again by train to Dorpat. (283-285) The place seemed nice to the Büchers (285), which in August, if it does not rain, it certainly is. Mithoff helped Bücher to find lodgings, and they moved in to his predecessor Stieda’s old apartment in Teichstraße 37. (286)⁵⁰

Bücher’s description of his daily life is in line with the typical Dorpat and generally professorial memoirs of that time – his house (286, 288-289, 293, 297), the unusual collegiality and friendliness among the faculty (286, 291, 303, 315–316, 318; cf. Schwabe 1915:8–9), the seasons (288, 290–291, 297, 313), city and

⁴⁹ Incidentally, this is true of today’s University of Tartu as well – the vote of the University Council is final – , quite opposed to German universities then and now, where the state ministry has the last say and with some frequency decides against the university vote.

⁵⁰ According to the official faculty calendars, Bücher lived first at no. 15 (*Personal...* 1882:3) and only later at no. 37. (*Personal...* 1883:3) Neither house exists anymore, as the area was levelled during World War II. The street (now translated into “Tiigi”) does exist and in 1993–1994 housed the senior author of this essay (no. 9) and since 1996 the Faculty of Social Sciences (no. 78).

landscape (289–291) – but much more plastically and deeply, perhaps also with different sentiment, than ordinary ones. His description of the winter preparations are as beautiful as they are accurate. Living in the Russian Empire did not seem to be a problem. (313)

Bücher, with his disgust for honors (see 425–427; Barthel et al. 1959:80–81),⁵¹ appreciated that in Dorpat colleagues among each other did not use titles. (Bücher 1919:303, 425; see also Schwabe 1915:9) He notes the democratic bearing among the faculty; probably, he surmises, because their salaries were so similar. (Bücher 1919:303) Friends of his were the anatomist Ludwig Stieda, who also served as godfather of Bücher's son Friedrich (316), the Classicist Georg Löschcke, Mithoff, and the semitist Wilhelm Volck. (313) Alexander v. Oettingen was an acquaintance (288), but contrary to Wagner, it appears that no scholarly discourse of any kind took place – odd, if one considers that Bücher's chair and interest was statistics-focused, and that Oettingen was by far the most eminent statistical theoretician in this part of the world.

4.2. *The University*

Bücher's description of university life is unusually full and vivid. Dorpat was, according to him, generally like most German universities but different in key points (293), and not necessarily worse for it. (303) There were five faculties: Divinity (five chairs), Legal (six), Medical (eleven), Historical-Philological (nine), and Physico-Mathematical (nine). (293–294) Every faculty was headed by a Dean, elected for three years – exactly as today. Faculty councils included both chaired and extraordinary professors. (293) The University was governed by a Rector, elected for four years from among the chaired professors by the University Council. Decisions by the Council needed approval by the Ministry, by the Curator, or were made autonomously, depending on the type of case at hand. The budget was administered by a commission formed by all Deans and chaired by the Rector. (294)

As Bücher mentions, the unusually long time of service for Rector and Deans guaranteed greater continuity than at the Imperial German universities, where they were only serving for one year. (294; see Schwabe 1915:34–35) The problem, of course, is that good scholars cannot then become functionaries, because the Dorpat periods were too long. (See also Bücher 1903:3) This quite collegial style of administration ended in 1889 with the first step of full Russification, after which the Rector was appointed by the Minister and approved by the Emperor

⁵¹ Bücher tells a funny story involving his Napoleonic uniform, which Dorpat professors – as Russian civil servants – wore at formal events instead of gowns. (1919:300–302) What is interesting is Bücher's general dislike of any academic garb, which he calls “masquerade”; in spite of his anthropological interest, he does not seem to have ever realized the positive side. (But see 427–428)

rather than elected by the Council. The Prorector and the Deans were henceforth appointed by the Curator and approved by the Minister. (Engelhardt 1933:506, 492)⁵²

In Russia and thus also in Dorpat, professors were elected for 25 years, after which for another five, then for another, final five. The salary of the professor emeritus was the full one he had last earned (at least theoretically, Laspeyres 1876:15; Schwabe 1915:34); the two optional five-year periods entailed salary increases. (Bücher 1919:303; Schwabe 1915:33–34) All years spent at a Russian university since the *Habilitation* counted. (Laspeyres 1876:15) Many of the former Dorpat professors returned with their ample retirement income to some German university in an unsalaried capacity. (Bücher 1919:303) This – for a German-language university – unique feature, together with the character of Dorpat as a stepping-stone rather than a final appointment, at least for the Imperial Germans, had the effect that Dorpat had the youngest professoriate of all, excepting the newly-founded universities of Straßburg and Czernowitz, with an average age of the chair-holders being 46 and only two professors older than 60. (Laspeyres 1876:13–15)

Bücher's predecessor Laspeyres has made an eloquent case of why an older professoriate is not advantageous for a university that sees her proper mission. (1876:29–38) Ludwig Schwabe, in Dorpat 1863–1872, however, points out the disadvantages of the Dorpat practice: a comparatively small group (because prolongation needed a two-thirds majority) could topple a professor, and the road was free for “butchering”, which indeed did happen. (1915:34) Of course, when Russification set in, this *procedere* was also a tool to make professors retire or to force them to teach in Russian. (See, e.g., Engelhardt 1933:489) Since 1889, too, professors could only be prolonged by the Curator with approval of the ministry. (506)

But during Bücher's time, he reports, “The freedom to teach was never touched at the University. We could move as freely as if we had been employed by a university in the German Empire”. (1919:311) Indeed, when moving to Switzerland, then an epitome of political freedom, Bücher claims: “in Dorpat, the University was more free and more independent than in Basel. The University of Dorpat really governed itself”. (323)

⁵² The Rector at the time of Bücher's arrival was the surgeon Eduard v. Wahl (see Käbin 1986:256–259), to whom Bücher in very polite terms ascribes partiality for his fellow Baltic Germans among the faculty. (1919:294) By way of an anecdote, Bücher tells about the opening of his personnel file, during which he was asked, “When did you last time attend Holy Communion?” After Bücher's amazed reply that he did not know, the Rector hastily told the secretary: “Just write, some time ago!” (1919:295–296) Prorector was the German (Engelhardt 1933:278) eminent pharmacist, Johann Georg Dragendorff. (Bücher 1919:294; Käbin 1986:133–139; Engelhardt 1933:293; cf. Siilivask 1987:114)

4.3. *The Field*

Bücher's salary was ample. (297) There was a Statistical Cabinet (i.e., institute), which had been founded by Stieda. (296) Since it received official publications free of charge and had some money to buy books, this allowed Bücher – necessary in light of the then as now poor university library – to conduct practica, which were well-attended and instructive for Bücher himself. (296)

As far as instruction was concerned, there was a professional degree course in “Political Economics” with many students enrolled. The curriculum included ample mandatory courses in Statistics; Statistics was also part of “Geography and Statistics” and “Russian History and Statistics.” The teaching load was six hours a week, practica included. (295) In his first term (Fall Term 1882), Bücher read “*Gewerbepolitik*”, which had been announced by Stieda and transferred to his chair from Mithoff's Political Economy chair. In Spring Term 1883, Bücher read “History, Theory, and Technique of Statistics”, and in Fall Term 1893, “Population, Economic, and Cultural Statistics”. (295)

Grading the examination papers did not please Bücher, because he did not think the students' German too good, and Bücher was “still too much a school-teacher in order to ignore such insufficiencies.” (300) Also, while not having to actually teach Geography, part of his job was to examine the future *Gymnasium* teachers on the subject, which Bücher did unwillingly, only based on memories from his Frankfurt days as a teacher himself. (300)

Bücher's statistical classes had about 40–50 participants. (324) He judged his Dorpat students as having a good general education, but not being very interested in scholarship. (299; cf. Schwabe 1915:31) Only a few of them, Bücher notes, were willing to join the Russian civil service, which they considered corrupt. (1919:299–300) “That one only had to instruct the youth of a master race at the expense of the state, this thought never crossed our mind in Dorpat, close as it perhaps lay. The language of instruction was German...” (311)

5. Baltic Germans and Russians

As was to be expected, Bücher soon became no particular friend of the Baltic Germans. Not that he appreciated them less than some of the Imperial Germans at Dorpat – he very clearly says that the Germans who had gotten stuck in Dorpat had become Russified. (311) In Dorpat there had always been tension between Baltic and Imperial Germans (see Wittram 1964:58; Eckardt 1869:380; Siilivask 1987:112; differently Schwabe 1915:7). The latter emphasized internationality, and they were more positive towards the Russian government (partially because they did not have their culture to defend and were, after all, guests), the former were trying to fill empty chairs at all costs only with natives, “even if they were deficient in scholarship.” (Bücher 1919:304; differently Naunyn 1925:179; also

A. Keyserling 1902.2:272) This tension became quite strong in the 1880s with the beginning of Russification.

“The Germans in the Baltic Provinces”, Bücher explains, “are a master race with all virtues, but also with all flaws, of such a one. The latter were not infrequently adapted from the Russians, although one did not want to admit this.” He thought that Dorpat was the breeding ground for the best people in the Russian Empire and noted the career advantages of the students, as well as that Baltic Germans talked about Germany as their motherland, not their fatherland. (310)

In Baltic German society, Bücher also noticed with disapproval the view, which he said was prevalent, that personal connections were the key to success, rather than achievement. (312) “That claims had to be matched by achievements, nobody seemed to understand. Especially that the latter were demanded by us Imperial Germans, occasionally led to disagreements when chairs had to be filled, which better would have been avoided.”

Bücher talks about former colleagues who had gone back to German universities with their Dorpat retirement salary and who were extremely conservative (because they had not kept up with the times) and at the same time upset that their scholarly achievements were not sufficiently appreciated. (311–312) “The worst were those who felt themselves as victims of Russification and who wanted to be treated as such.” (312)

Amongst the Baltic Germans who had dedicated themselves to some sort of science, a degree of self-overrating could often be found which under the conditions of a large nation cannot arise. Amongst the blind, the one-eyed is king, and thus one should not be surprised that these people had been assured in their narrow Northern home that they would be very eminent scholarly phenomena, and that they thus made claims to which in fact they were not entitled. Such Baltic docents have been welcomed at German universities in the most generous manner; one can indeed speak of a ‘Baltic Period’ of our universities just as one could speak about a ‘Holstein Period’ earlier. If one later was able to realize that one was only dealing with mediocre minds, usually nothing could be done about it anymore. (312)

Into the one and half years which Bücher spent in Dorpat fell also one of the most fateful events in the history of the University of Dorpat, the so-called *Senatorenrevision*, led by Nikolai Avksentyevich Manassein. Manassein became later, under Emperor Alexander III, Minister of Justice; in 1883, however, he was the “*revidirende Senator*” (Samson-Himmelstjerna 1891:97 n. 1) in the Baltics, charged with reviewing matters there in light of the new Russian perspective.

Bücher tells the story of Manassein’s visit to the University very well. The professors of the University were introduced to the Senator, and he, being Russian and being within as well as representing the Russian Empire, spoke to them in Russian. However, even those professors whose native language was Russian, answered in German. (1919:305) Manassein’s account of the University therefore was, and was almost bound to be, highly critical. The main conclusion to which he came was that, if in the earlier 19th century she had its very important role as

mediator between the Western and Russian scholarship, by now she had completely lost this position. Dorpat was not even able to meet the local needs of education anymore. (Palamets 1982b:130) And since Dorpat had in the Senator's view become the political centre for Baltic Germans as well, he proposed to change the language of instruction from German to Russian. (130; Thaden 1969:52)

Manassein's visitation was for Engelhardt "the infamous" one which

under the guise of objective examination of the legal situation of the *Land* and of the necessity or reform falsified in the most un-self-conscious way the facts in order to meet the pan-slavic desires with crafty, dialectic would-be reasons and to play in front of the Russian, indeed European, public the role of the liberator of the peasantry from 'medieval-feudal' serfdom in which the liberal blessings of the great Russian nation-state idea were announced to [the peasantry]. (1933:480)⁵³

But it is difficult to see to what other result the Senator could come. For the Baltic Germans, it was impossible to comprehend "what the reform measures in the sixties [had] meant for liberally minded Russian intellectuals and statesmen: men like Juri Samarin, Grand Duke Constantin Nikolaievich or N. A. Miljutin bore in themselves the vision of a Russia which slowly developed into one nation with a rational and uniform legislature and a well-ordered *Staatswesen*". (Thaden 1969:46) As the Emperor Alexander II himself had reminded an audience in Riga in 1864, "I would like you gentlemen not to forget that you belong to the very same one Russian family and that you are an unremovable part of Russia". (Quoted in Petuhhov 1906:8)

It is thus not hard to imagine that, next to the language question, "what irritated Manassein particularly" was the University's function as a catalyst and center of the 'Baltic Party'. (Thaden 1969:52) This is one of the very curious things about the University of Dorpat and its relations to the Russian State: on the one hand, she was the "high citadel of loyalty to the Emperor"⁵⁴ (Brennsohn 1927:473), and nobody could be as Russian as the Baltic baron;⁵⁵ on the other, she was center of

⁵³ Samson-Himmelstjerna, who called Manassein a representative of the "official nihilism" of the Russian Empire and a "liberal despot" (1891:95), describes the Senator's activities in the Baltics as follows: "Charged as Senator with the *Revision* of the courts of the Baltic *Länder*, the current Minister had acted in a truly Jacobine fashion in these provinces and thus had laid the foundation to his 'national' popularity". (1891:96-97)

⁵⁴ It was rather usual in the late 19th century that rebellious students from other Russian universities, like Veressajev, were sent to Dorpat.

⁵⁵ Bücher reports that the Curator at the time of his arrival was a Baron Stackelberg, who reminded him of the adage of Polish squires who had told him that among all Russian civil servants, none they dreaded more than the Baltic baron, "who always would believe that he had to prove to them first how Russian he was." (1919:304) The Curator had even held back calls of foreigners to chairs which his successor, the "Russian Russian" Kapustin, promptly sent to St. Petersburg for approval, which was granted immediately. (304)

Baltic separatism. This unbridgeable gulf between the loyalty to the state and at the same time the identity of being utterly different, non-Russian and thus not part of Russia seems to have its roots in the Baltic-German self-definition as that of outpost of Europe and Europeanness.

This attitude is indicatively expressed by Alexander von Oettingen's definition of the relation between *Haus* and *Heimat* of the Baltic Germans. (A. Oettingen 1906) Oettingen goes back to Martin Luther's *Mahnschreiben* of 1523, *An die Christen zu Righe, Rewel und Tarbthe*, and quotes the for him essential sentence: the Germans in those cities "at the end of the world like the heathen have received the saving Word with all desire". (1906:10) The feeling of being at the end of the world and having the responsibility to bring the "saving Word" to the local people, to the East, and not only or even mainly in the religious sense, was to remain the main underlying attitude of Baltic Germans to the Russian state as well as to Estonians and Latvians. And thus, speaking of the University of Dorpat, Oettingen said that "Her almost unique significance thus lay in that [she] so-to-say was a bridge-post for the stream of culture of Western European scholarship into the culturally needy East." (41)

But the central point is that the Baltic Germans did not see the Baltic provinces as a genuine part of Russia at all. Bücher's predecessor Schirren had argued in the *Livonian Answer* that they were German provinces associated with the Russian Empire by treaty and with full privileges. (1869b:192–194) Bücher calls these privileges "allegedly certified forever" (1919:310), a serious sin in Baltic German eyes indeed. Thus, Bücher says that "The position of the Baltic Germans towards Russia was not at all an un-self-conscious one and even less a prudent one. Amongst themselves it was a truism that anything Baltic would be superior to anything Russian and that in no point concessions should be made to the government." (305)⁵⁶

On the other hand, Bücher argues, stuck in the 1710 privileges, the Baltic Germans never wanted to be part of the 'real' Germany. (310; cf. Engelhardt 1933:317–318) He was strangely moved by the Dorpat students singing German student songs and even "Deutschland, Deutschland über alles" – he found this somehow inappropriate. (1919:302; cf. Schwabe 1915:81, for another view) Indeed, especially after the formation of the German Empire in 1871 (cf. 76–77), the Baltic Germans' insistence on their Germanness rang strangely in the ears of Imperial Germans in the Baltics and in the Empire. This was because the Baltic

Bücher mentions that Kapustin, if partially because of shady private life, was in spite of his friendliness treated badly by the Dorpat faculty and thus moved to Riga (305-306; this was not unusual, a predecessor of his, Gervais, had done the same; Schwabe 1915:41). Bücher got along quite well with Kapustin (Bücher 1919:367), who because of his role in the Russification is a horror figure for the Baltic Germans. (See Engelhardt 1933:483)

⁵⁶ This passage is also cited in Siilivask 1987:112, the only reference to Bücher in this essay, although its author lists several much less eminent Dorpat scholars. (See 113)

Germans were pre-Nation State, 18th century-style Germans.⁵⁷ The tragedy of Baltic German identity in the later 19th century, thus, was that its defining points were loyalty to the Russian Emperor and to their Germanness, but that in the eyes of both Russians and Germans at that time, the price they would have had to pay for being admitted into either fold would have been the abandonment of just that identity.

6. The Language Question

As had become visible in the reception of Manassein at the University of Dorpat, the one overwhelming question since the re-foundation⁵⁸ of the University in 1802 was her “relation to the state language” (Petuhhov 1906:4), symbol and symptom of Baltic German as well as Russian identity. Andrei Kaisarov, probably one of the most brilliant teachers and scholars in the beginning of 19th century at Dorpat, was the first one who dared to give a speech in the *Aula* of the University in Russian. (Lotman 1958:156) In 1812, he spoke, to make things worse, “On the Love of the Fatherland”, in which he made a vehement case for Russian: “I would be very pleased to see, if you, young man, as you learn here to educate your mind and heart ... would understand how important is for you the language of the greatest nation in the world, the language of your fatherland”.⁵⁹ But, as Juri Lotman has argued, he remained a lonely fighter. (156)

None better was the situation with the teaching of Russian, although it seems to have been a constant worry of the leaders of the University to have decent teachers and professors for Russian and also for fields like Russian History and Law.⁶⁰ From the 1860s there is a story about a professor of Russian language and literature, Rossberg; as the Baltic German Tiling says, “*ein verrusster Deutscher*”. (1906:15) He had to give the exams of Russian for all students of all faculties,⁶¹ and it became a habit to “do” the exam for some roubles. (15)

⁵⁷ As was noted in the segment on Schirren *supra*, Bismarck himself, who did not want any antagonism with Russia, particularly not during German Unification, therefore kept the Baltic Germans at great distance. This is excellently discussed by Rothfels 1930:esp. 238–239 (and also 1960); however, his attempt to reconcile Bismarck and Baltdom (239–240) is too forced to ring true.

⁵⁸ There is hardly any publication from the 19th century in which the year 1802 is mentioned as the year of the re-founding, it is always seen as the founding. Today, however, the focus is on Gustavus Adolphus’ foundation in 1632. Next to the prestige an early foundation-date bestows, this also has to do with the creation of a Swedish rather than a German-Baltic past.

⁵⁹ Quoted in Lotman 1958:156. See also Veressajev 1971 and, more positively, Arnold 1892.

⁶⁰ Regarding the problems of teaching Russian in the beginning of the 19th century, see Süß 1928:224[–226], n. 134.

⁶¹ Dissertations, however, were written in Latin until the end of 1859, since then mainly in German. (Brennsohn 1927:472, n. 1)

As for Bücher himself, he predictably took the scholarly-objective position and thus ran into problems. As has been mentioned, part of his chair's assignment was a course on the "Statistics of Russia", which he had dreaded. (1919:305) Wagner, who taught economics for half of his teaching load, had not read the course, leaving it to Theodor Graß; this had been part of Wagner's call. (Graß 1967:3) Fortunately for Bücher, he was able to work out a similar deal, in that he would have not to teach the course either; rather, his colleague Alexander Brückner did (1919:295), who from 1872 until 1891 held the Chair of Russian History. (Engelhardt 1933:516, 477; Masing et al. 1918:118; Wittram 1964:74)

However, Bücher had initially planned to learn Russian because of it (see Bücher 1919:292), because to teach such a class "seemed impossible to me if I could not use the original sources in the national language". (305) He had therefore asked for and received a native Russian student (incidentally, a nihilist who had been relegated to Dorpat for improvement; 1919:305; cf. Raun 1987:136), which the Curator noted. (Not that Bücher ever really learned Russian, at least not well; Bücher 1919:310) "The Balts amongst my colleagues were very upset at this 'accommodation', and several of them will have looked at me with mistrust from that point on, although I have always tried my hardest in my official conduct to stay strictly objective everywhere and to keep myself away from all party business." (305)

That in a situation like Dorpat in the 1880s, neutrality in these questions, from a German professor, was necessarily interpreted as treason by some of the Baltic Germans, was however clear – and actually, Bücher was not even neutral. He even understood the Russians' insistence on teaching in country schools in Russian. (309) The problems that arose out of the conflict, he says, one could have prevented "if one had realized that the government had considerable right to determine in the state-funded schools the subjects taught there, too." (310)

For Bücher, there was, as a matter of fact, a nation state called Russia which had some Western provinces in which the local aristocracy spoke a different language. That the government of this nation state did not want to fund a culture that was inherently antagonistic and which showed no sign whatsoever of a willingness to adapt,⁶² yet continued to live off the labor of the indigenous population, was something that Bücher found not difficult to understand.

7. The Estonians

The last point might remind one of the fact that so far in this essay, the local majority population, the Estonians, have been entirely left aside. And so it was,

⁶² On the Russian arguments against funding a German Dorpat, see the Slavophile leader J. S. Aksakov's arguments, quoted in Engelhardt 1933:480–481 (and on Aksakov from an Estonian perspective, Rosenthal 1913:3). Engelhardt (481[–482], n. 2) cites Imperial German voices which were supportive of this view.

too, folklore and the like excepted, in the minds of the academics in Livonia in the 1880s. The year of Bücher's arrival, 1882, actually marked the first serious attempt to establish at the University a professorship in Estonian. There had also been an earlier one, in 1878, when a meeting of Estonian nationalists had called for a Chair of Finno-Ugric Languages, especially of Estonian and of Estonian Ancient History. (Palamets 1982b:128) However, there the matter rested. In 1882, in connection with Manassein's visit, the proposal had been revived and sent to the Senator. (128)⁶³ A larger discussion was held in the *Gelehrte estnische Gesellschaft*, which ended with Leo Meyer's statement that although there was a need for a Chair of Estonian, there was no suitable candidate, although the Estonian side had proposed Hurt again. (128)⁶⁴ The proposal still came to nothing, since, as Bücher rightly indicates, the Estonians' interests were used by both sides, by Baltic Germans as well as by Russians to pursue their own respective goals. (1919:308–309)

The Estonian nation was at this time just starting to emerge. Orlando Figes certainly overstates the point when he argues, speaking of the nationalities of the Russian Empire generally and specifically of Estonians: "Isolated in their remote settlements, without schools or communications with the broader world, the vast majority of the peasants had no concept of their nationality. Theirs was a local culture dominated by tradition and the spoken world". (1996:75; see also Rosenthal 1912:9) However, after the Swedish times, ironically enough it was the Baltic Germans themselves who, through the study of folk-songs and customs, helped to provide the economic and cultural foundations for the awakening of Estonian nationalism. Otto Wilhelm Masing, the 'creator' of the Estonian written language, for instance, never considered himself an Estonian, and Friedrich Reinhold Kreutzwald, the compiler of Estonian national epic *Kalevipoeg* ("The Son of Kalev"), doubted seriously whether Estonians had the capacity for independent development. (Raun 1991:56)

Bücher's own attitude towards Estonians and their relationship to the Baltic Germans was again such that he looked at the situation he found himself in, and the historical justification did not really interest him. And what he saw was not, for him, appropriate. For Bücher, "the nonmeasurable realm of human dominion and resistance" was "the heart of the entire problem." (Davis 1974:14, referring to another yet similar scenario.)

⁶³ According to the *NDZ* of 3 (15) September 1882, there was a flow of petitions to Manassein (from "the people"), and in those which concerned the University, one of the two main claims was to establish a professorship for Estonian.

⁶⁴ This was and still is interpreted as a nationalistic argument against the Estonians. (See Cederberg 1926–1929:320; Palamets 1982b:128) However, it rather seems that Meyer really meant what he said, *viz.* that Hurt, in spite of his indubitable merits (he is today depicted on the Estonian 10 Kroon banknote), was not on the formal level of a Dorpat professor.

Parts of Bücher's attitude might be a bit hard to swallow today because it is not politically correct, such as when he points at the physical weakness of the Estonians, a legacy – according to him – of serfdom, and when the Bücher's Estonian maid is depicted sympathetically but for us somehow condescendingly, as “friendly and good-natured, but incredibly careless and clumsy” and full of naiveté and devotion (1919:287), especially as this mirrors the general clichés. Bücher also notes that the Estonians themselves shared the attitude that they held a position much lower than the Germans. (308; see also 308–309; cf. Rosenthal 1912:332–333; but see also 354–367)

Bücher, however, did not share this view; his wife even learned Estonian, or tried to. (1919:310) For the problems of the cultural level of the Estonians at that time, he outright put the blame to the Baltic Germans, which among the occupants of his chair was nothing new – already Ewers had criticized the situation of the Estonian peasants. (Engelhardt 1933:73)

Perhaps even worse [than the behavior of the Baltic Germans towards any objective scholarly critique] was the antagonism between the Germans and the original population of the *Land*. The Estonians had in those days awoken to a national consciousness, and now the German minority had to pay for not having Germanized them at a time when they would have accepted the German language with pleasure. Only a few Estonians who had dedicated themselves to Theology were until then dissolved in Germandom. (Bücher 1919:307–308)⁶⁵

At the University, Estonian language was represented by a lecturer named *Weske*, and I myself have frequently overheard that a domestic theologian enumerated all the benefactions which one had bestowed upon *Weske*, and who accused him of despicable ingratitude because he stayed loyal to his fellow tribesmen. This was the general attitude which the Germans in the *Land* held; all which had been done by the barons for the country population was mightily exaggerated, and one did not want to hear anything about the sins of one's forbears against their serfs. (308)⁶⁶

Bücher says that the “Russian authorities did not fight the antagonism which had developed between Germans and Estonians, but they rather promoted it. They were quite pleased if the influential German minority had to face some difficulties.” (309) The alliance was in a way beneficial for the Estonians. (See Rosenthal 1912:348–350) As Bücher tells the story, the Russians even appeared to allow the Estonians build their own *Gymnasium* (see also 308; Raun 1987:139)

⁶⁵ Similar from the Estonian side Rosenthal 1912:1vi, 9–10, 17; against this opinion cf. Schwabe 1915:7; Engelhardt 1933:319.

⁶⁶ The other main cause for “the people's” petitions to Manassein (see note 63 *supra*) had been to raise the salary of the teacher of Estonian to 1,000 roubles. (*NDZ*, 3 (15) September 1882) As Toivo Raun notes, this lectureship was the only place where Estonian scholars held a university appointment during Dorpat times. (1987:141)

but then commanded the instruction to be in Russian. (Bücher 1919:309; see also 315)⁶⁷

Possibly the Estonians still preferred that over an institution in which the language of instruction had been German. Ancient-rooted hatred was not so easily removed, and if they preferred to be commanded by the Russian government rather than by the *Ritterschaftliche* corporations, then there were reasons for it. (1919:309; cf. Rosenthal 1912:353-354)⁶⁸

Bücher describes how he sometimes sensed the difference between Germans and Estonians when going to the bank, where a baron came to take out a loan and an Estonian to make a deposit. (1919:313)

Perhaps I was wrong, when looking at the former, if I was reminded of the *morituri* of the Pole Kraszewski and if the latter seemed to me to be the member of a rising people. The German squires in Estonia always impressed me as an elite class at a stand-still, and I have never been able to consider the Estonians, in spite of their low cultural standing, as so low as it was common in the *Land*. (313)

Bücher also notes that there was no idea at all among the Baltic Germans that there could be equal rights between the nations, let alone a form of democracy. (310) Completely unusual is that Bücher felt so uncomfortable in Livonia because of all this that it significantly contributed to his eventual leaving. Indeed, Bücher and his wife were so sensitive towards these matters that they did not even enjoy walks (or better hikes): “In Dorpat, the feeling for the beauties of the open nature was difficult to arise, which surely is connected with the fact that any connection with the mass of the population was missing for us. One felt as one was sitting on an isolation-chair (*Isolierschemel*).” (313)⁶⁹ Bücher’s attitude, which would be considered high treason of the worst kind by the Baltic Germans, is best summed up in the following statement:

Of course, we never got ourselves mixed up with the inner quarrels of the nationalities in the *Land*; but we were still uncomfortable living among a population which in the depth of their hearts took an enemy’s position towards Germandom, and we have understood the atrocities of the year 1905 quite well. (310)⁷⁰

⁶⁷ Issakov (1986:456) points out that Bücher was mistaken in that the school in question was actually not intended, nor established, as a *Gymnasium*.

⁶⁸ Bücher says that Germans and Estonians were linked by religion, but that the Estonian ministers and the Divinity Department at Dorpat represented a kind of Faith “which already was not acceptable for the enlightened Germans, but which failed completely with the Estonians and Latvians.” (1919:313–314)

⁶⁹ This image is a common one for Dorpat, although generally used in a different meaning – not as isolated among the Estonians, but from Imperial Germany and one’s colleagues and compatriots. (Thus Schwabe 1915:47)

⁷⁰ See also Agthe 1909:158; on the atrocities and their interpretation from a Baltic perspective see briefly Engelhardt 1933:485–486.

8. Academic Fights

8.1. Keussler's Ph.D.

But Bücher (one is tempted to say, “of course”) did get mixed up in precisely these quarrels in two scholarly controversies where Bücher stood against German Baltdom. In 1883, Bücher was on the Ph.D. board of Johannes v. Keussler (or Keußler, as Bücher spells him). Keussler was in the process of writing a larger work on the history and critique of the farmers' communal property in Russia. (1876–1887) Volume 1 had appeared in 1876; in 1882, Keussler was awarded the academic Prize of the University for this work. (Engelhardt 1933:457) Volume 2, part 1 Keussler wanted to use as his Ph.D. thesis. (Keussler 1876–1887:2.1) Because of this, there was a public defense, the opponents being the three most-involved professors: Bücher, Mithoff, and the Balt Johannes Engelmann, Professor of Russian Law between 1860 and 1899 (Engelhardt 1933:394; see Wittram 1964:75). Engelmann was a very strong supporter of Baltdom; because Russification of Dorpat started, appropriately, with the Law Faculty and because Engelmann had the main Chair of Russian Law, he was one of the leaders in the fight against Russification in the 1890s. (Engelhardt 1933:489) As Bücher says, Engelmann

venerated the idea, common among the Germans of the Baltic Provinces, that the order of the agrarian affairs had found in these the most perfect imaginable and that the Russian communal property would indeed be a damnable institution. From this position, he harshly attacked the doctorant, and the latter thus got in such a state of excitement that even my praise in the end could not mollify him. (1919:306)⁷¹

Keussler later sent Bücher a letter of apology for his own behavior, but “the matter was not over yet. A few days later, in the *Rigaische Zeitung* an article appeared under name of a Mr. *von Samson*, in which the Historical-Philological Faculty of Dorpat was strongly attacked for having allowed a man like Johannes von Keußler to attain the doctorate.” (Bücher 1919:306-307; see 1910:764)⁷²

Keussler published volume 2.2 also in 1883 and volume 3 in 1887. The work is a careful and scholarly one, and it is fair to say in retrospect that volume 2.1 is a very valid thesis, for this time as well as for ours. It is interesting how seriously Bücher took all this – after all, Keussler got his degree, and a tough examination, on what after all was not purely (although very largely) a statistical work, is not entirely inappropriate. In later years Keussler was accepted as an authority by all sides, and the book as a standard account. (763; Tobien 1910:376; Agthe 1910:407 n. 1)

⁷¹ Cf. Schwabe 1915:25-26, who defends the Baltic position.

⁷² We have not been able to locate this article in the *Rigaische Zeitung*, nor has Issakov (1986:456), which would indicate that Bücher was mistaken, perhaps just about the place of publication.

8.2. Agthe's Ph.D.

Bücher says, too, that he would not have even mentioned the Keussler affair had he not experienced a parallel case a few decades later. (1919:307; cf. 1910:763) This was a controversy about a Ph.D. thesis at the University of Leipzig on Livonian agrarian matters which Bücher had supervised. As the most direct scholarly involvement of Bücher with the Baltic Germans and in light of the highly important matter of agrarian order, this story deserves a closer look and detailed documentation.

Agthe's thesis, the title of which can be translated as *On the Origins and Situation of Agricultural Laborers in Livonia* (1909), had been written upon the suggestion of Bücher (Agthe 1909:159), perhaps because of Agthe's Baltic background (he had been educated in Riga and had studied at Jurjev before coming to Leipzig; 159). In this very detailed but certainly argumentative and normative thesis, Agthe sets out to prove that the "peasant liberation" in Livonia did not improve the lot of the peasants, but that under the guise of personal liberation, "the peasants"⁷³ once again came under complete personal dependence from the squires⁷⁴." (2)⁷⁵ The conclusion to which he comes is that the agricultural laborers in Livonia, working in what can be called *corvée*, still had to fulfill many obligations from the times of *socage*⁷⁶:

Just recall the long working-hours, the road-building *socage*, the non-paid transport of products, the non-paid plowing service of the farm-laborer's wives, the drafting of children whose school attendance is compulsory for animal-tending, the passport system, the lack of social care in case of poverty and

⁷³ The word "farmers" is only used in this text when it refers to independent farm-owners. All those who work the land but are in some form of dependence are referred to as "peasants". But it is important that the latter was comprised of three distinct classes: more or less dependent farmers who had some say over their ground, farm-laborers or *Knechte* who were steadily employed either there or at the manorial farm, finally day laborers (*Lostreiber*, a form of *Tagelöhner*) without fixed employment.

⁷⁴ The estate-owning Germans, almost completely aristocratic Baltic Germans, are called "squires" here (especially as translation of *Gutsbesitzer*).

⁷⁵ Just three years before, there had been a similar case when Edgar Loening, a friend and colleague of Bücher, published an article in the *Baltische Monatsschrift* entitled "Die Befreiung des Bauernstandes in Deutschland und in Livland", which was to cause quite a vehement reaction (see also Bücher 1919:308), and in which he argued that the agrarian reform in Livonia at the beginning of the 19th century meant that "the abolition of serfdom" became only "the founding of a new *Knechtschaft*". (1880a:127) To this H. Bruiningk replied, mainly with the argument that Loening's materials were not sufficient to draw such conclusions, suggesting that Loening was wrong. (See Bruiningk 1880; also Loening's answer, Loening 1880b; on Loening himself, see Grabar 1903)

⁷⁶ "Socage" is used here as the translation of *Fron*, as part of serfdom (*Leibeigenschaft*); the arrangements after the abolition of serfdom and the legal granting of personal freedom is called "corvée".

sickness and the sinking-down of old-age laborers who cannot work anymore into the class of the day laborers. (157)⁷⁷

Agthe goes so far to say that “one will have to look for the *causes of the Revolution*” of 1905 in this situation. (158; cf. Bücher 1919:310)

This thesis Bücher “accepted for the supplements of the *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft*”. (307) Given the highly controversial nature of the topic, the authorship of a Balt, and the prestigious and highly visible place of publication, this work could not go unchallenged, nor did it. Bücher reports that he had explicitly told Agthe what would happen if he published this investigation. (1910:764) And indeed, “it unleashed a storm of protest in the Livonian newspapers and journals.” (1919:307; see Bücher in Tobien 1910, editorial note, 158; Agthe 1910:396)

But the main scholarly reply was written by Alexander (v.) Tobien, the Director of the *Ritterschaftliche* Statistical Bureau in Riga. Tobien was a defender of the squires, one of “those who tried to hold up the flag once unfolded by Schirren in his *Livonian Answer*” (Engelhardt 1933:344), but he certainly was also the leading expert on Livonian agrarian history and law. (See Tobien 1899–1911, 1905; cf. Bücher in Tobien 1910, editorial note, 158) For this reply, Bücher gave him space in the *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft* – more than usual and appropriate, as he says in an editorial footnote which, it must be said, could prejudice the reader against Tobien’s arguments. (158) Tobien’s reply (1910) is certainly more sophisticated than the usual squierarchical diatribes, even admitting mistakes on the side of the Baltic Germans. (1910:176) It is still quite polemical, however, and full of attempts to discredit Agthe as a scholar. The latter’s argument is called slavophile (160), and he is said to neglect those scholars whom he calls “concerned parties” (*Interessenten*), including Tobien himself. (162)

Tobien’s at first sight most convincing tool is that of comparison. As he had already stated in 1905, “the specificity of the agrarian laws of Livonia becomes more clearly apparent if they are compared to those of the Western European countries”. (1905:40) Credited with an interest in “an as objective-historical as possible study” of the agrarian situation (Engelhardt 1933:406), his comparative approach is still dealt with today, even from the Estonian side. (Kahk 1996) Juxtaposing the different points of complaint by Agthe with the situation

⁷⁷ The original German reads:

Es sei nur erinnert an die lange Arbeitszeit, die Wegbaufronden, die unentgeltliche Abfuhr der Produkte, den unentgeltlichen Scharwerksdienst der Knechtfrauen, das Heranziehen der schulpflichtigen Kinder zum Hütedienst, das Passsystem, die Prügelstrafe, die mangelhafte Fürsorge im Falle der Armut und Krankheit und das Herabsinken der altersschwachen und erwerbsunfähigen Arbeiter in die Klasse der Lostreiber. (Agthe 1909:157)

From the Estonian side, this attitude was shared; Rosenthal 1912:27–28.

elsewhere, especially with the allegedly progressive Denmark, Tobien insists that the different measures were not atypical – there was corporal punishment in Denmark (386), even longer working-hours in Pomerania, Brandenburg, and Posen (387), wife and child labor in the eastern part of Germany (387–388), and the situation of the *Landknechte* was not worse than that in Westphalia, Oldenburg, Hanover, and Eastern Holstein. (390–391)

Although *prima facie* a modern approach, this eclectic and selective comparison is little more than a trick. Tobien culls bad aspects from many different areas in Northern Europe, but in Livonia, they were all combined, resulting in a situation that, because of the cumulative effect, was much worse than the mere addition of these measures would present. Second, just empirically it seems to be clear that there is a qualitative difference between a dominion situation in which the dominating side is almost completely of different ethnic or racial origin than the dominated one. Finally, in matters such as these, concerning the ethics of human interaction, Bücher's approach to look at the situation in Livonia and not how it might be elsewhere, is more appropriate, because it does not really matter whether things were bad somewhere else also.⁷⁸

In traditional Baltic ways, Tobien sees the cause of the 1905 revolution in the agitation of social-democrat-influenced primary school teachers (394–395; see Engelhardt 1933:485–486) If one, however, notices that the first reason which Tobien lists for why in the 18th century semi-serfdom was transformed into full serfdom was “the racial differences which separate the masters (*Herren*) from the peasants” (1910:165), it appears that agitation was hardly necessary.

To this reply Agthe rebutted, as is the scholarly custom, in the same issue. (Agthe 1910) He did not take up the polemic side but just refuted (quite well) the charges of bad use of sources and statistics by Tobien. There was just one polemical statement: “If *T.* finally confronts me with the slightness of my material, I can only reply that not everyone has a *Ritterschaftliches* statistical bureau at his disposal. To process this in such a way that it proves what one wants

⁷⁸ This was also the view of even the most moderate and Germanophile of Estonians (see Rosenthal 1912:27–28, 30-31, referring exactly to these legacies of serfdom). – In a 1996 article, one of the leading Estonian agrarian historians of today, Juhan Kahk, lengthily cites Tobien (544–546; also 550, 553, but not Agthe or Keussler) and rescinds on his own former judgment that “the type of agrarian reform conducted in the Baltic provinces was for the peasants the very worst.” (546) He compares the reforms in Prussia, the Baltic provinces, and Russia and comes to the result that, contrary to Marxist history, “In reality ... at least in the Baltic provinces, both the squires and the farmers lived through the transitional period without significant losses, while just the peasantry developed a large activity.” (553) Kahk declares the “Prussian-Baltic” and Russian approaches as largely similar and, if anything, more beneficial to the peasants in the former region. (555) Kahk's essay bears the title “Die baltischen Agrarreformer des 19. Jahrhunderts in neuer historischer Perspektive”, yet both his methods and results reproduce a very old perspective, rather than a successful *volte-face* on the part of its author. On the problems of handling such a phenomenon by purely quantitative matters, cf. Haskell 1975.

seems to be a privilege of the bureau heads.” (407) This rebuttal, Bücher says, caused

great indignation in the Baltic Provinces. The reply by Tobien was sold by the book trade without my knowledge, without the anti-critique by Agthe even being mentioned. At the same time, the latter and myself were decried in the worst manner and the University of Leipzig was attacked for having bestowed the doctoral degree upon Agthe. Thus I was prompted to make a statement myself in which I had to ascertain that all those always fell to the fate of disparagement who held an objective opinion of the Baltic agrarian situation in the literature. (Bücher 1919:307)

This reply, indignant, scathing, and witty, leaves no doubt about Bücher's views. (1910) It seems indeed that he was particularly upset at Tobien's essay having been published, without mentioning Agthe's counter-reply, as a leaflet (1910:762; we have however found no trace of it). The articles in the daily press, Bücher says, he ignored, “and I have just been amazed how far some of their anonymous authors had diverged from the rules of good education which otherwise is held so high in the Baltic Provinces.” (762) But he had to reply to an article by Gustav v. Stryck, Perennial Secretary of the Imperial Livonian Charitable and Economical Society. Stryck had attacked Agthe's education, to which Bücher replied that, after all, it had come from Livonia. (763) Regarding the matter in general, Bücher approvingly quotes a Livonian statement from 1862:

Whoever raises his voice seriously for the peasants, spoken or written, can be sure of the most bitter persecution and libel. In addition, there is among common people a very understandable partiality for the German fellow tribesman. The result is an overall limitlessly partisan view of the situation among us so that highly estimable men, who lack neither education nor knowledge of foreign lands, act frequently as if smitten by blind- and deafness when they speak of their own fatherland, of Livonia and Couronia. (764)

One of the main accusations by Stryck against Agthe's rebuttal had been that the latter had charged Tobien with being professionally biased. Stryck is quoted as saying that

If men like *Alexander Tobien* are accused of *Dienstschreiberei*, as has happened here, without the editors objecting, let alone suppressing it until they have the most exact information, then one must not be silent towards such carelessness (!). With the one all of us are being insulted who *have the professional duty to stay in constant touch with a certain sphere of influence*. (764–765)

To this Bücher replies:

Mocks himself and doesn't know how!⁷⁹ This is exactly what pushes us in science towards such a great care when using the greatest part of Livonian agricultural writings, that they come from authors who stood “in constant touch

⁷⁹ This is a quote from Goethe's *Faust I*.

with a certain sphere of influence”, in German: who were “influenced”, and be it only by class prejudices (which they themselves were not aware of) and perhaps occasionally also by class interests. (765)

Tobien was certainly a qualified and diligent scholar, who even received an honorary doctorate in economics (Dr.rer.pol.) from the University of Greifswald. (See Tobien 1930, cover) However, to call him unbiased is indeed impossible, and one may go so far as to say that his interest and mission are so marked that his statistics are only to be used with the greatest caution.⁸⁰

Bücher concludes the Agthe-Tobien story in his autobiography by stating: “The opinion leaders of the *Ritterschaft* tried through literary terrorism to cut off any free discussion and to discredit any opinion different from their own as unscholarly.” (1919:307; see 1910:763, 765) Looking at the long tradition of dissent in the Baltics, Bücher seems to somewhat succumb to his polemical streak here, but there is of course more than a kernel of truth in this observation. In the 1910 article, he is as strong, and one thought from it turned out to be particularly significant in light of what happened later:

But that I know: it can never lead to the recovery of the agrarian situation in the *Land* if today’s generation continues to defend the sins of the fathers ... or even to praise mistakes that they have made as agro-political main accomplishments instead of calling them by their true name and, as far as this is still possible, to ameliorate them. (765).⁸¹

⁸⁰ Because it is both so indicative and extreme, Tobien’s 1930 (and thus ex-post) summary of the role of the Baltic Germans should be mentioned here. He analyzes the situation of the Baltic provinces as that of a “Colonial Type”. (1930:314) The rare domination of a large lower class was possible because of the Baltic Germans’ propensity for community and self-government, based on personal independence and supra-personal community. (314–315) “There must never be talk about the harming of the land and its inhabitants through one-sided class policy of the aristocracy incorporated in the *Ritterschaft*” (315) because the Baltic baron “saw himself placed between the foreign-languaged *Heimatgenossen* and the powerful foreign-languaged and -faithed Russian bureaucracy.” (315–316) The proof of the friendly government, Tobien says, is how fast the Estonians and Latvians moved from serfdom to their own nation states. (316) The Baltic Germans’ main focus had been the promotion of church and school for the country population, “not only out of patriarchal spirit, because in the sense of a humanitarian education to independence and self-responsibility”. (316)

The image of the Baltic barons as guardians of the Estonians against the bureaucracy as their *raison d’être* must really be the most bizarre interpretation of Baltic-Estonian/Latvian relations during the times of the *Ritterschaft*. It is true that the barons were not really paternalists – however, not because they were more liberal, but because their form of ‘paternalism’ was less similar to, say, the British Social Tory type (cf. Drechsler 1995b) than to that of the planters in the American South towards their slaves. (Cf. Oakes 1983:192–224)

⁸¹ The full final passage reads in German:

Ich weiß nicht, ob den wahren Interessen der livländischen Ritterschaft, die ich mit denen des baltischen Deutschtums nicht identifizieren werde, mit einer Art des literarischen Kampfes gedient ist, bei welcher der Gegner von vornherein wehrlos gemacht ist. Denn daß es Herrn Dr. Agthe fast unmöglich ist, in der Presse seines

9. Dorpat Publications

Finally, how did Bücher do as a creative scholar during his Dorpat times? Complaints about the low standard of scholarship at Dorpat during Bücher's time were not rare. The University seemed to have her own specific character in this respect, and this is perhaps best expressed by a jingle from the early 19th century:

Und Dorpat?

Ist 'ne Universität,

Übernimmt sich nie, sondern hält Diät. (Süss 1928:145)

In 1872, Carl v. Hehn started to publish in the *Baltische Monatsschrift* a series of articles called "Plaudereien eines Heimgekehrten". The third article in the series,⁸² subtitled "Ueber baltisches Schriftstellertum", caused quite a fierce flow of articles against him,⁸³ especially from the side of the University. Hehn began by stating that "the learned gentlemen on the Embach [the river flowing through Dorpat] do not seem to rate the art of book-making too highly". (285) He claims that, "apart from some essays in professional journals", the *Moralstatistik* by Alexander von Oettingen (1868) was the only more substantial book published during the last five years by the scholars of Dorpat.⁸⁴ (289)

Landes sich zur Wehr zu setzen, ist seinen tapferen Angreifern im voraus bekannt. Das aber weiß ich: Zur Gesundung der agrarischen Zustände des Landes kann es nimmermehr führen, wenn die heutige Generation fortfährt, die Sünden der Väter, die nun einmal an den Kindern heimgesucht werden bis ins dritte und vierte Glied, zu verteidigen oder gar von diesen begangene Fehler als Großtaten agrarpolitischer Einsicht zu preisen, anstatt sie mit ihrem wahren Namen zu nennen und, soweit das noch möglich ist, wieder gut zu machen. Der Versuch, durch literarischen Terrorismus die freie Diskussion abzuschneiden, mag im Lande selbst vielleicht noch eine Zeitlang gelingen; an dem Schrifttum der großen deutschen Kulturgemeinschaft wird er machtlos zerschellen, und es kann in der übrigen Welt nur ein mitleidiges Lächeln erwecken, wenn ritterschaftliche Literaten in Livland sich und ihren Freunden ein Monopol der "Wissenschaftlichkeit" vindizieren. (1910:765)

⁸² In *Baltische Monatsschrift* 1872:285-290.

⁸³ See especially Boettcher 1872, and the editorial entitled "Anmerkungen", in *Baltische Monatsschrift* 1872:291; also from the editors, "Plaudereien über Plaudereien", 479-488, as well as the anonymous reply by a student.

⁸⁴ One of the first answers to Hehn came from the professor of pathological anatomy, Arthur Boettcher. He argued that Hehn was very wrong at least as far as the Medical Faculty was concerned. Boettcher brings a table containing the number of publications of the medical faculty during the years 1867-71:

1867	18 publications
1868	28 publications
1869	27 publications
1870	15 publications
1871	17 publications. (1872:391)

Boettcher, however, does not specify what kind of publications these are, although he argues against Hehn's statement that what Dorpat scholars mainly publish can be called plain journalism

Hans H. Meyer, professor at medical faculty during Bücher's time, also noted that one of the basic features of Dorpat professors was that "– apart perhaps from the gentlemen who had just arrived from Germany – there was not the kind of industrious strife, nor so much restless work and publishing, as we are generally used to see with the scholars in Germany". (1933:386) Instead, it was rather usual and accepted that "next to professional work, in Dorpat one always had considerable leisure, be it for social chats and intellectual exchange, be it – and that was chiefly the case with the Baltic Gentlemen, particularly from the other faculties – for the pursuit of other scholarly or artistic hobbies". (386)

The claim that Dorpat scholarship was not on the level it should be at a university is again echoed and partially explained in the famous psychologist Emil Kraepelin's *Memoirs* (1987), who likewise held a Dorpat chair during the 1880s:

The general scientific life in Dorpat was stimulating, as there were always a number of younger professors present, who worked with enthusiasm. Of course, the complete seclusion of Dorpat was unfavourable. We had almost no contact at all to the Russian universities, only went to Germany once every few years and visitors from Germany were rare. We were left to our own resources and any new ideas or incentives from the homeland or "abroad" had to keep us going until about Christmas. From Christmas onwards the intellectual vigour gradually began to diminish, partly influenced by the long, dull, crippling winter, until the prospect of the much longed for holiday revived our spirits. (46)

Bücher himself admits that he was not very productive in Dorpat (1919:322), and this would be the judgment from today's perspective as well. He several times laments that preparations for new courses each term took all his time. (278, 292, 294) There was also the lack of archives, and he even had an accident which made the use of his hand difficult for a while. (296–297) However, these complaints are so frequent that they sound defensive.

Famous is Bücher's very true statement that in Dorpat, one "finds the necessary peace and quiet. We are not bothered by exciting public meetings and chamber debates, no theater and balls; not even a decent pub calls to *Stammtisch* and beer-mug." In his daily plan, Bücher lists time between the 7 am breakfast and noon for preparation for his lectures. These are from 12 noon to 1:30; lunch at 2 pm. (292) This is followed by a walk, and then working time until 7:30 p.m. Dinner at 7:30, and 10 pm or 10:30 is bedtime. (292) Christmas holidays were from 4 December to 20 January (not dissimilar to now), so that there should have really been enough time for scholarship. Considering his later and earlier output, Bücher must have been unusually conscientious in his lecture-preparations if with this time-table, he really did not have some time for research and writing.

and not scholarship (Hehn 1872:286), that in medicine scholarly journals are almost the only way where to publish. (Boettcher 1872:392-394) Hehn probably meant, though, the daily press. And "as far as numbers which are listed by the Professor are concerned, I naturally accept them as correct, but I deny that with these, he has proven the publishing-fertility of the University of Dorpat." (1872:581)

Looking at Bücher's publications from this time, *Die Arbeiterfrage im Kaufmannstande* (1883b) appeared when he was in Dorpat, but it had been completed in Munich already. (Bücher 1919:277–278, 322) He worked some on Frankfurt archival excerpts (297–298), but no publication arose, at least not then. It was also in Dorpat that Bücher started to conceive of Newspaper Science, journalism, or media studies⁸⁵ as an academic discipline and special area of scholarly investigation, and he spent the summer vacations of 1883 on this subject, too, only that the source situation was too bad. (Bücher 1919:299; Fischer and Minte 1981, xvi) Since Bücher virtually founded and institutionally established the field as a discipline in Germany, perhaps even in Europe,⁸⁶ this is not without interest.

Bücher's only genuine publication while at Dorpat is an essay on a new child labor law in Russia (1883a), which, while published in a good place, is little more than a report of the law with some commentary. While interesting in a reminding way in its comparison with other countries (Russia was in that area not less progressive than many Western nations), it is more a journalistic than a scholarly accomplishment. In addition, he had generally been invited to contribute to the *Jahrbücher* by its editor, Bruno Hildebrand, some years before. (Bücher 1919:198)

⁸⁵ Bücher preferred Newspaper Studies; see Schmidt and Knipping 1959:73. This is a field which, in German, has more different names than even Political Science (*Politologie*, *Politikwissenschaft*, *Wissenschaftliche Politik*, and *Wissenschaft von der Politik*), namely first Newspaper Studies (*Zeitungskunde*), then Newspaper Science (*Zeitungswissenschaft*), then *Publizistikwissenschaft* and *Publizistik* (no translation feasible), and now together with the last one – „(almost) synonymously“ (Neverla 1997) – Communication Science (*Kommunikationswissenschaft*), Media Science (*Medienwissenschaft*), and Journalism (*Journalistik*).

⁸⁶ In 1916, Bücher founded the Leipzig *Institut für Zeitungswissenschaften* (after having established a departmental division already in 1915), with the aid of the publisher of the *Leipziger Neueste Nachrichten*, Edgar Herfurth, who perhaps had taken Pulitzer's foundation of a similar institute at Columbia University as a model. (Fischer and Minte 1981:xxxii–xxxiv; Schmidt and Knipping 1959:60–61, 63–64 [quoting a letter by Bücher to the Saxon ministry]). In 1921, Newspaper Science became an examination subject, and in 1922, it is taken to have been permanently established. (Fischer and Minte 1981:xxxv, xxxix)

With this foundation, Bücher introduced a new field to German universities (Braeuer 1955:718; Schmidt and Knipping 1959:58), perhaps even Newspaper Science as a scholarly field at all. (Everth quoted in Fischer and Minte 1981:xlili; Reimann 1994:7) Leipzig would remain in the forefront, also establishing the first Chair (7) in 1926, which was when Bücher retired from the directorship of the Institute, aged 79. (Fischer and Minte 1981:xxxviii, xl; Schmidt and Knipping 1959:75) Only ten years after Bücher's foundation and still during his lifetime, there were eight more such institutes, i.e. altogether at about a third of the German universities (Reimann 1994:7), and over two thirds of the latter offered some instruction in this field. (Schmidt and Knipping 1959:61) This establishment, both at Leipzig and in Germany, of a not particularly welcomed discipline, appears to be Bücher's personal accomplishment, unimaginable without both his prestige and stubbornness. (Fischer and Minte 1981:xxxii, xxxviii) Today, there are 41 degree courses in the field at German, Austrian, and Swiss universities and, in Germany alone, more than 10,000 students. (Neverla 1997)

Bücher's inaugural lecture at Dorpat, delivered on 6 (18) September 1882, on "The Relations of Statistics and History", seems to have never been published separately. There is no reference to it in any of the bibliographies or texts. Fortunately, we can infer what he said from an article about the lecture which appeared, unsigned and in the 'news' section, in Dorpat's main newspaper, the *Neue Dörpt'sche Zeitung*, the following day, 7 (19) September. (Bücher 1882)

According to the report, Bücher explained "in an exciting way ... *the relations of statistics and history* and threw light on several recent attempts at historical statistics by initially raising the question of how far the counting of statistics as one of the historical disciplines might be justified." Not only is it justified to use statistics in studying history, he said, but there is even no real confrontation between the two areas, because there is no "science which can entirely do without statistics, i.e. the systematic observation of the masses, and history especially is most closely related to statistics, in as far as it aims at the display of the development of the human race in its entire scope, in material and spiritual respect." (1882)

However, statistics is not an autonomous area; rather "it is important to always remain in sight of history in order not to lapse into unfruitful formalism and to conceive of the process of societal development as a mere 'budget of things'." This does not, however, mean that statistics is a kind of "*Hilfewissenschaft*"; rather, Bücher wants to prove exactly the opposite. Thus, "statistics must feel itself called to fixate also the societal conditions of more distant times and to thereby create a floor which gives to the historian, too, a most welcome solid basis." Bücher tries to further show how this kind of statistical survey, based on original research rather than on older sources, has already changed the then prevalent view of Middle Ages. (1882)

Bücher's publications are few especially if compared to those of Wagner, whose generally most important work written at Dorpat, during the winter 1865/66, was the entry for Statistics in the *Deutsches Staats-Wörterbuch* (Wagner 1867).⁸⁷ His principal publication with a local connection during his Dorpat tenure was *Die russische Papierwährung* (1868b; based on two articles previously published in the *Baltische Monatsschrift*, 1867–68 and especially 1868a), a spirited attack on paper currency. Wagner also wrote the already-mentioned significant article on "Die auswärtige Politik Rußlands und ihre Bedeutung für Preußen", published anonymously in the eminent *Preußische Jahrbücher*. (1866b) Less well-known are his *Beiträge zur Finanzstatistik des Schulwesens in den Städten des Ostseegouvernements Livland, Kurland und Esthland* (1866a), which however are not only a source for Baltic history but also an interesting contribution to the debate over the public financing of education.

However, Bücher is different from Wagner in that the latter would not come back in his work to the Baltics during his later career, while the former would.

⁸⁷ Wagner 1892:141; quoted in Hanel 1997:546 n. 59.

One example is the quarrel over the Agthe Ph.D. thesis, another the large chapter⁸⁸ on his time in Dorpat in the autobiography, a considerable work in its own right and a key source both of description and analysis of university affairs and ethnic matters in the Baltics of the 1880s.⁸⁹

There is also some Estonian influence in Bücher's today perhaps most famous and certainly most intriguing work, *Arbeit und Rhythmus*. (1924) Bücher had always been interested in folk and children's songs; he had collected the former since his post-graduate days and the latter during vacations at home in Kirberg. (Bücher 1919:189–190) Nothing came out of this, but they were the basis for *Arbeit und Rhythmus*. (1919:190) This study of the connection of music and labor rhythm is called "Michelangelesque" by Zwiedineck (1930:9) and by Erwin v. Beckerath of all his works the "*Krönung ..., eine genial gesehene Beziehung*". (1960:226; on the impact see Bücher's preface to the final edition, 1924:v–vii). It went through six editions and was translated, curiously enough, not into English (which was deplorable for the reception) or French, but Russian; it appeared there in 1899 and experienced a second edition in 1923 (references given in the entry for Bücher 1924 in the bibliography).

In *Arbeit und Rhythmus*, one finds a separate sub-chapter, in the chapter on the work songs of larger groups, on "Estonians and Latvians". (1924:315–321) It contains three Estonian (and three Latvian) songs in German translation. (318–320) Bücher cannot let the opportunity pass to make a hit against the squires:

⁸⁸ Perhaps it is biased to think of this chapter as particularly vivid, systematic, and interesting, but it covers 42 pages out of 456, i.e. 9,2%, while the time spent in Dorpat – fourteen months – only occupies, out of the 46 years which the autobiography covers, 2,5%, which means that Dorpat is overrated by 368%. Because Bücher spends considerable time on his youth – less on his personal life than on the surroundings –, this is quite indicative. If we just look at the professional and thus comparable appointments, Basel (7 years, 100 pages including much non-Basel text, 21,9% text towards 15,2%) and Karlsruhe (2 years, 24 pages including likewise more of the Leipzig story, 5,3% text towards 4,3%), they are only 144% resp. 123% overrated, i.e. the overrating relation is more than 2.5 or even almost 3 times higher in the case of Dorpat.

⁸⁹ The book was so successful that the first two chapters were published separately, five years later, as *Nassauisches Dorfleben*. An earlier version of the first chapter had been prepublished in the *Alt Nassauischer Kalender* of 1918 (according to the editorial note in the *Dorfleben* publication, 99) This is all the more surprising because Bücher's is an utterly unsentimental description, very rich – because of retrospective emphasis of the author – in ethnological detail. Only the smaller part of the first two chapters, indeed, refers to Bücher himself. In 1986, the Dorpat chapter appeared in an Estonian translation. (All references given in the entry for Bücher 1919 in the bibliography)

Bücher's *Recollections...* are among the most beautiful autobiographies by scholars we have, not only because in them we are encountered by a strong personality, but because they also make visible the context in which this life was passed. – A scholar's fame soon fades away. With his recollections, Bücher built for himself a monument which will keep the memory of him alive, even if his other writings should be scientifically superseded. (Skalweit 1946:9)

In the place of song, through which those doing sojage determine the tempo of their work, the squire used, in order to speed up the work, the favorite instrument of the Estonians, the bagpipe, through which the working beat could be ordered by the overseer. The defenders of the erstwhile situation deem it necessary to stand up for the squires against the accusation that he would exploit the working power of his workers more than appropriate. (317; see Agthe 1909:157)

Bücher notes that during hay harvest, even small children had to work (1924:317), and that complaints about hard squires who would hurry the laborers were common in Estonian folk songs (317; see Schwabe 1915:22–23 for the different view). In addition to this segment, there are frequent references to Estonian examples in the text, including six more full Estonian folk songs, of which two are given both in Estonian and German. (Bücher 1924:83–84, 110–111, 134, 147, 150, 152–153, 161, 348–350, 453–454)

10. Farewell

Bücher's son Friedrich, his only child, who would become a judge in Leipzig, was born in Dorpat on 17 (29) August, 1883. (Bücher 1919:315; *Wer ist's?* 1928:224) Bücher reports that the birth 'hit home' the problems the distance of Dorpat from Germany had for family life. (1919:316) Also, the chair of economics and statistics at the University of Basel had become free (the holder, Alphons Thun, had been called to Freiburg; 316), and Bücher was called to it by the Basel University *Kuratel*. (316) Bücher says that he was at first not very inclined to accept (316); after all, the salary was roughly the same (316, 324), and the Basel appointment was not more prestigious, nor really *in* Germany, either. In addition, "To leave the German-Russian University and the city in which we had been so happy seemed to me unthinkable, even like a challenge to fate. But in the end I gave in to family considerations and accepted." (316; see also 319:423) Bücher also reports that a spree of arson contributed to this; while it turned out that the culprit was an "insane student" (316, n. 1), it is indicative that Bücher considered the possibility that it might have been more than that.

The call to Basel was already for Winter Term 1883/84; however, it was agreed upon that Bücher would only arrive in November. Bücher tried to compensate for this and teach 'at double speed' in Dorpat. (316) He also examined those students who wanted it by giving them the prescribed examination in statistics. (318) After that, he returned to Germany by steamer to Pleskau (Pskov) and then on with the express train, coming from St. Petersburg, to Berlin. While saying farewell to his Dorpat apartment, he had broken down and started to cry. (319)

"We went into an uncertain future. When it had arrived, for a long time I longed for Dorpat and have regretted that I had left it – a feeling which I have

otherwise never permitted in my life to arise. Whether I would have maintained my satisfaction, had I stayed longer – who knows?” (322)

Address: direct all correspondence to
 Wolfgang Drechsler
 Chair of Public Administration
 Faculty of Social Sciences
 Ülikooli 18, University of Tartu
 EE-2400 Tartu, Estonia
 E-mail: drechsler@physic.ut.ee

References

Archival Sources

Estonian History Archives, Tartu:

Karl Bücher. Fond 402, list 3, file 231.

Wilhelm Stieda. Fond 402, list 3, file 1605.

Books and Articles

- Agthe, Adolf (1909) “Ursprung und Lage der Landarbeiter in Livland”. Phil.diss. Leipzig. Tübingen: Laupp.
- Agthe, Adolf (1910) “Zur Kritik des Herrn Tobien über ‘Ursprung und Lage der Landarbeiter in Livland’”. *ZgStW*, 66, 396–407.
- Alma Mater Tartuensis (1632-1982)* (1982). Tullio Ilo mets and Hillar Palamets, eds. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
- Arnold, Yurij (1892) *Vospominanija*, 1. Moscow: Bogdanov.
- Backhaus, Jürgen, ed. (1997) *Essays in Social Security and Taxation. Gustav von Schmoller and Adolph Wagner Reconsidered*. Marburg: Metropolis.
- Backhaus, Jürgen and Richard E. Wagner (1987) “The cameralists: a public choice perspective”. *Public Choice*, 53, 3–20.
- Barthel, Heinz, Günther Kesselbauer and Manfred Voigt (1959) “Karl Bücher. Seine politische und wissenschaftliche Stellung”. In Engelberg et al. 1959, 78–91.
- Beckerath, Erwin v. (1960) “Karl Bücher”. In *Professoren der Universität Basel aus fünf Jahrhunderten. Bildnisse und Würdigungen*. Andreas Staehelin, ed. Basel: Reinhardt, 226–227.
- Bertram, Θ (1868) *Dorpat's Grössen und Typen vor vierzig Jahren*. Dorpat: Gläser.
- Blum, Karl Ludwig (1828) *Einleitung in Rom's alte Geschichte*. Berlin – Stettin: Nicolai.
- Boettcher, Arthur (1872) “Offener Brief an den heimgekehrten Plauderer”. In *Baltische Monatschrift*, 3(21), 390–400.
- Brauer, Walter (1955) “Karl Wilhelm Bücher”. In *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 2. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 718–719.
- Brennsohn, I[sidorus] (1927) “Auszüge aus seinen ‘Erinnerungen an die Studienjahre in Dorpat 1875–81’”. *Eesti Arst*, 12, 470–480.
- Bruiningk, H[ermann] (1880) “Apologetische Bemerkungen”. *Baltische Monatsschrift*, 27, 253–272.
- Bücher, Karl (1882) “Die Beziehung von Statistik und Geschichte”. Inaugural Lecture in Dorpat, 6 (18) September. Summarized in *NDZ*, 7 (19) September, “News” section.

- Bücher, Karl (1883a) "Das russische Gesetz über die in Fabriken und Manufakturen arbeitenden Minderjährigen vom 1. Juni 1882". *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik*, 7(41), 7, Jena: Fischer, 541–548.
- Bücher, Carl (1883b) *Die Arbeiterfrage im Kaufmannstande*. Deutsche Zeit- und Streitfragen, vol. 12, no. 181. Berlin: Hubel. [Verified but not seen.]
- Bücher, Karl (1924) *Arbeit und Rhythmus*. 6th edn. Leipzig: Reinicke. [1st edn. Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Abteilung der Königlich Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, vol. 17, no. 5, Leipzig: Hirzel (later Teubner). 2nd edn. 1899, Leipzig: Teubner; 3rd edn 1902; 4th edn. 1909, Leipzig – Berlin: Teubner; 5th edn. 1919, Leipzig: Reinicke. Russian edns. (verified but not seen): *Rabota i ritm*. Moscow 1899. 2nd edn. 1923.]
- Bücher, Karl (1910) "Ein letztes Wort zur Livländischen Agrarfrage". *ZgStW*, 66, 762–765.
- Bücher, Karl (1919) *Lebenserinnerungen*, vol. 1 (1847–1890). Tübingen: Laupp. [No second volume. Pre-edition of the first chapter (1918) in *Altmassauischer Kalender*, „Schellenberg – Wiesbaden“, 32–57. 2nd edn. (1924) of the first two chapters as *Nassauisches Dorfleben*. Hessen-Nassauische Bücherei, Heft 4/5. [Otto Stückrath, ed.] Melsungen: Heimatschollen-Verlag, A. Bernecker. Abbreviated repr. of several chapters (1981) in Bücher 1981, 3–76. Estonian translation of one chapter (1986) as „Mälestused“. Sirje Laud, tr. In *Mälestusi Tartu Ülikoolist (17.–19. sajand)*. Sergei Issakov, ed. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, 318–331.]
- Bücher, Karl (1981) *Auswahl der publizistikwissenschaftlichen Schriften*. Heinz-Dietrich Fischer and Horst Minte, eds. Publizistik-Wissenschaftler im deutschen Sprachraum, vol. 1. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Cederberg, A. R., ed. (1926–1929) *Eesti Biograafiline Leksikon*. Tartu: Loodus.
- Davis, David Brion (1974) "Slavery and the Post-World War II Historians". *Daedalus*, 103, 1–15.
- Djakonov, M. A. (1903) "Johann Philipp Gustav v. Ewers". In Levitski, vol. 2, 510–537.
- Drechsler, Wolfgang (1995a) "Staatssozialismus". In Hanno Drechsler et al., eds. *Gesellschaft und Staat. Lexikon der Politik*. 9th edn. München: Vahlen.
- Drechsler, Wolfgang (1995b) "Benjamin Disraeli's Social Toryism: Sanitas Sanitatum, Omnia Sanitas Reconsidered". *International Review of Comparative Public Policy*, 6, 217–243.
- Drechsler, Wolfgang (1997) "State Socialism and Political Philosophy". In Backhaus, 319–339.
- Drechsler, Wolfgang (forthcoming) "Natural vs. Social Sciences: On Understanding in Economics". In *Evolutionary Economics and Spatial Income Distribution*. Erik S. Reinert, ed. London: Edward Elgar. Preprinted as *University of Tartu Working Paper in Public Administration and Government* 97-06.
- Eckardt, Julius (1869) *Die baltischen Provinzen Rußlands. Politische und culturgeschichtliche Aufsätze*. 2nd edn. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot.
- Engelhardt, Roderich v. (1933) *Die Deutsche Universität Dorpat in ihrer geistesgeschichtlichen Bedeutung*. München: Ernst Reinhardt.
- Engelberg, Ernst et al., eds. (1959) *Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig, 1409-1959. Beiträge zur Universitätsgeschichte*, vol. 2. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Esenwein-Rothe, Ingeborg (1992) *Wilhelm Lexis. Demograph und Nationalökonom (1837-1914)*. 2nd edn. Frankfurt/Main: Haag & Herchen.
- Figes, Orlando (1996) *A People's Tragedy. The Russian Revolution 1891-1924*. London: Cape.
- Fischer, Heinz-Dietrich and Horst Minte (1981) "Karl Bücher – Leben und Schriften". In Bücher 1981, v–xlili.
- Garleff, Michael (1987) "Dorpat als Universität der Baltischen Provinzen im 19. Jahrhundert". In Pistohlkors/Raun/Kaegbein 1987, 143–150.
- Gaspari, Adam Christian and F. J. Bertuch, eds. (1800-1803) *Allgemeine Geographische Ephemeriden. Verfasset von einer Gesellschaft Gelehrten*, vols. 5–11. Weimar: Industrie-Comptoir.
- Gernet, A[xel] v. (1902) *Die im Jahre 1802 eröffnete Universität Dorpat und die Wandlungen in ihrer Verschaffung*. Reval: Kluge.
- Grabar, V. E. (1903) "Edgar Friedrich Löning". In Levitski, vol. 1, 630–633.
- Graß, Theodor (1868) "Adolph Wagner in Dorpat und sein Übergang an die Universität Freiburg". Introduction by Rudolf Stucken. *Finanzarchiv*, 26 NF, 1 (March), 1–7.

- Hanel, Johannes (1997) "Statistical Regularities, Freedom, and Social Policy. Wagner and Schmoller on Freedom under the Statistical Law of Large Numbers. Or, Why Moral Statistics Precede Their Association for Social Reform". In Backhaus, 513–594.
- Haskell, Thomas L. (1975) "The True & Tragical History of 'Time on the Cross'". *New York Review of Books*, 2 October.
- [Hehn, Carl v.] (1872) "Plaudereien eines Heimgekehrten". *Baltische Monatsschrift*, 3(21), 69–83, 181–188, 285–290, 382–389, 471–478, 573–587.
- Heilmann, Martin (1980) *Adolph Wagner – Ein deutscher Nationalökonom im Urteil seiner Zeit. Probleme seiner biographischen und theoriegeschichtlichen Würdigung im Lichte neuer Quellen*. Frankfurt/Main – New York: Campus.
- Helmholtz, Hermann v. (1896) "Ueber die akademische Freiheit der deutschen Universitäten. Rede gehalten beim Antritt des Rectorats an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin". In *Vorträge und Reden*, vol. 2. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 191–212.
- Issakov, Sergei, ed. (1986) *Mälestusi Tartu Ülikoolist (17.–19. sajand)*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
- Kahk, Juhan (1996) "Die baltischen Agrarreformen des 19. Jahrhunderts in neuer historischer Perspektive". *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung*, 45, 4, 544–555.
- Käbin, Ilo (1986) *Die medizinische Forschung und Lehre an der Universität Dorpat/Tartu 1802–1940: Ergebnisse und Bedeutung für die Entwicklung der Medizin*. Sydsvenska medicinhistoriska sällskapets årsskrift Supplementum 6/1986. Lüneburg: Nordostdeutsches Kulturwerk.
- Keussler, Johannes v. (1876–1887) *Zur Geschichte und Kritik des bäuerlichen Gemeindebesitzes in Russland*. Vol. 1, 1876: Riga – Moskau – Odessa: Deubner. Vol. 2.1, 1882: St. Petersburg: Ricker. (Also Diss.rer.pol. Dorpat 1883; printer, C. Matthiesen). Vol. 2.2, 1883. Vol. 3, 1887.
- [Keyserling, Alexander] (1866) *Rückblick auf die Wirksamkeit der Universität Dorpat. Zur Erinnerung an die Jahre von 1802–1865*. Nach den vom Curator des Dörptschen Lehrbezirks eigezogenen Berichten und Mittheilungen. Dorpat: Mattiesen.
- Keyserling, Alexander (1902) *Graf Alexander Keyserling. Ein Lebensbild aus seinen Briefen und Tagebüchern*. 2 vols. H. v. Taube, ed. Berlin: Reimer.
- Keyserling, Leo (1894) "Lebensskizze des Grafen Alexander Keyserling". In *Aus den Tagebuchblättern des Grafen Alexander Keyserling. Philosophisch-religiöse Gedanken mit einzelnen Zusätzen aus Briefen*. H. v. Taube, ed. Stuttgart: Cotta, 5–34.
- Koch, Peter (1983) "Wilhelm Lexis". In *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 14. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 421–422.
- Kraepelin, Emil (1987) *Memoirs*. Berlin-Heidelberg: Springer.
- L., Ⓟ v. (1875) "Karl Ludwig Blum". In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 2. Repr. 1967 Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 738–739.
- Laspeyres, Etienne (1863) *Geschichte der Volkswirtschaftlichen Anschauungen der Niederländer und ihrer Literatur zur Zeit der Republik*. Preisschriften gekrönt und herausgegeben von der Fürstlich Jablonowski'schen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig, vol. 11. Leipzig: Härtel.
- Laspeyres, Etienne (1876) *Das Alter der deutschen Professoren. Ein Beitrag zur Universitätsstatistik und Universitätspolitik*. Deutsche Zeit- und Streit-Fragen, vol. 5, no. 74. Berlin: Habel/Lüderitz.
- Levitski, G. V. (1903) *Biografitsheski Slovar professorov i prepodavatelei imperatorskavo Juerjevskago, byvshago Derptskago Univesriteta sa sto let ego sushestvovania (1802–1902)*, 2 vols. Jurjev: Mattiesen.
- Lexis, Wilhelm (1876) "Die Geschlechtsverhältnisse der Geborenen und die Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung". *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik*, 27, 209–245.
- Lexis, Wilhelm (1910) *Allgemeine Volkswirtschaftslehre*. Die Kultur der Gegenwart, 2nd ser., vol. 10, pt. 1. Berlin – Leipzig: Teubner.
- Lexis, Wilhelm (1997) "Naturwissenschaft und Sozialwissenschaft". Inaugural Lecture in Dorpat. Essay version (1903) from *Abhandlungen zur Bevölkerungs- und Moralstatistik* (Jena: Fischer, 233–251) and original summary (1874) from *NDZ* (26 August [7 September]),

- reprinted as *University of Tartu Working Paper in Public Administration and Government* 97–04.
- Loening, Edgar (1880a) “Die Befreiung des Bauernstandes in Deutschland und in Livland”. *Baltische Monatsschrift*, 27, 89–129.
- Loening, Edgar (1880b) “Ueber die ‘Apologetische Bemerkungen des Herrn Baron Bruiningk’”. *Ibid.*, 348–354.
- Lotman, Juri M. (1958) *Andrei Sergeevish Kaisarov i literaturno-obshchestvennaja borba ego vremeni*. Utshenye Sapiski Tartuskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta, vol. 63. Tartu: University Press.
- Lotz, W. (1931) Nekrolog auf Karl Bücher. *Jahrbuch der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1930/31, 48.
- Malmberg, V. (1903) “Istoriko-Filologitsheskii Fakultet”. In Levitski, vol. 1, 327–348.
- Mansfield, Harvey C., Jr. (1985) “Introduction”. In Niccolò Machiavelli. *The Prince*. Chicago – London: University of Chicago Press, vii–xxiv.
- Manteuffel, Gustaw (1898) *Dorpat I. Byly Uniuersytet Dorpacki*. Lwow: Lozinski.
- Masing, L., H. Semel and A. Walter (1918) “Die historisch-philologische Fakultät”. In Semel, 99–121.
- Meyer, Hans Horst (1933) “Dorpater Erinnerungen”. *Eesti Arst*, 12, 8, 385–397.
- Meyer, Leo (1875) “[Ueber die Herkunft der Professoren der Universität Dorpat.]” In *Sitzungsberichte der gelehrten estnischen Gesellschaft zu Dorpat 1875*. Dorpat: Mattiesen, 1–17.
- Meyer, Leo (1887) “Ueber die Herkunft der Professoren der Universität Dorpat”. In *Sitzungsberichte der gelehrten estnischen Gesellschaft zu Dorpat 1886*. *Ibid.*, 1–27.
- Meyer, Leo (1900) “Persönliches, mit besonderem Hinblick auf die Gelehrte estnische Gesellschaft”. In *Sitzungsberichte der gelehrten estnischen Gesellschaft zu Dorpat 1899*. *Ibid.*, 1–24.
- Meyers Großes Konversations-Lexikon*, vol. 12 (1906). 6th edn. Leipzig – Wien: Bibliographisches Institut.
- Mithoff, Theodor K. (1874) „Kathedersocialismus”. Inaugural Lecture in Dorpat, 21 January (2 February). Summarized in *NDZ*, 23 January (4 February).
- Mucke, Joh. Richard (1869) *Zur Vorgeschichte des Deutschen Zollvereins, insbesondere die Bestrebungen des mitteldeutschen Vereins gegen den preußischen Zollverein*. Leipzig: Lißner.
- Mucke, Joh. Richard (1881) *Die staatliche Unfallversicherung. Kritische Bemerkungen über den Gestehtentwurf vom 8. März 1881 in der vom Bundesrathe beschlossenen Fassung betreffend die Versicherung der Arbeiter gegen Unfälle*. Berlin: Puttkammer und Mühlbrecht.
- Mucke, Joh. Richard (1883) *Deutschlands Getreide-Ertrag. Agrarstatistische Untersuchungen*. Greifswald: Abel.
- Mucke, Joh. Richard (1900) “Das historische Princip der Statistik, gegenüber Georg von Mayr’s Begriff der Statistik als Wissenschaft von den socialen Massen”. *Acta et Commentationes Imp. Universitatis Jurievensis (olim Dorpatensis)*, 8, 3.
- Mucke, Joh. Richard (1903a) “Kathedra geografii, etnografii i statistiki”. In Levitski, vol. 2, 588–602.
- Mucke, Joh. Richard (1903b) “Kathedra kamerlnyi nauki, finansov i torgovli, pereimenannaja v 1865 g. v katedre polititsheskoi ekonomii”. *Ibid.*, 602–613.
- Naunyn, B. (1925) *Erinnerungen, Gedanken und Meinungen*. München: Bergmann.
- NDZ = Neue Dörpt’sche Zeitung.
- Neue Dörpt’sche Zeitung, various issues, 1874–1883.
- Neverla, Irene (1997) “Ein Kind der Bildungsreform. Warum die deutsche Kommunikationswissenschaft durchaus Zukunft hatte”. *Die Zeit*, 24 January.
- Oakes, James (1983) *The Ruling Race. A History of American Slaveholders*. New York: Vintage.
- Oettingen, Alexander v. (1868) *Die Moralstatistik. Inductiver Nachweis der Gesetzmäßigkeit sittlicher Lebensbewegung im Organismus der Menschheit. = Die Moralstatistik und die christliche Sittenlehre. Versuch einer Sociaethik auf empirischer Grundlage*, vol. 1. Erlangen: Deichert.

- Oettingen, Alexander v. (1906) "Haus und Heimat". In *Heimatstimmen. Ein baltisches Jahrbuch*, vol. 2, 5–45.
- Oettingen, Georg v. (1898) "[Dodatek]". In Manteuffel, G., 83–91.
- Palamets, Hillar (1982a) "Tartu Ülikool aastail 1865–1889: 1. Ülikooli juhtimine ja struktuur". In *Tartu Ülikooli Ajalugu*, vol. 2. K. Siilivask, ed. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, 118–123.
- Palamets, Hillar (1982b) "Tartu Ülikool aastail 1865–1889: 3. Õppejõudude koosseis aastail 1865–1889". In *Tartu Ülikooli Ajalugu*, vol. 2. K. Siilivask, ed. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, 125–130.
- Personal der Kaiserlichen Universität zu Dorpat* (1882). 1882, Semester II. Dorpat: Schnakenberg.
- Personal der Kaiserlichen Universität zu Dorpat* (1883). 1993, Semester I. Ibid.
- Pistohlkors, Gert v., Toivo U. Raun and Paul Kaegbein, eds. (1987) *Die Universitäten Dorpat/Tartu, Riga und Wilna/Vilnius 1679–1979. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Wirkung im Grenzbereich zwischen West und Ost. Köln – Wien: Böhlau.*
- Petuhov, E. V. (1906) *Imperatorskii Jurevskii, byvshii Derptskaa, Universitet v poslednii period svoego stoletjaga sushestvovania (1865–1902)*. [Vol. 2.] St. Petersburg: Senatskaja Tipografia.
- Ratzel, Θ (1878) "Adam Christian Gaspari". In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 8. Repr. 1968 Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 394.
- Raun, Toivo U. (1987) "The Role of Tartu University in Estonian Society and Culture, 1860–1914". In Pistohlkors/Raun/Kaegbein 1987, 123–142.
- Raun, Toivo U. (1991) *Estonia and the Estonians*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.
- Reimann, Horst (1994) "Die Anfänge der Kommunikationsforschung. Entstehungsbedingungen und gemeinsame europäisch-amerikanische Entwicklungslinien im Spannungsfeld von Soziologie und Zeitungswissenschaft". In *Publizistik- und Kommunikationswissenschaft: ein Textbuch zur Einführung in ihre Teildisziplinen*. Wolfgang R. Langenbacher, ed. Wien: Braumüller, 7–23.
- Roos, Arand, comp. (1985) *Estonia – A Nation Unconquered*. Baltimore, MD: Estonian World Council.
- Rosenthal, Heinrich (1912) *Kulturbestrebungen des estnischen Volkes während eines Menschenalters (1869–1900). Erinnerungen*. Reval: Cordes & Schenk.
- Rothfels, Hans (1930) "Reich, Staat und Nation im deutsch-baltischen Denken". *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswiss. Kl.*, vol. 7, no. 4. Halle: Niemeyer.
- Rothfels, Hans (1960) *Bismarck, der Osten und das Reich*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Samarin, J. (1868) *Okrainy rossii*, vol. 1: *Russkoe Baltiskoe pomorie*. Prag: Tipografia Dra. F. Skreischkago.
- Samson-Himmelstjerna, H. v. (1891) *Russland unter Alexander III. Mit Rückblicken auf die jüngste Vergangenheit*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot.
- Schirren, C[arl] (1869) *Livländische Antwort auf Herrn Juri Samarin*. 3rd edn. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot.
- Schirren, C[arl] (1878) *Ueber Machiavelli*. Rede beim Antritt des Rectorats an der Königlichen Universität zu Kiel gehalten am 5. März 1878. Kiel: Universitäts-Buchhandlung.
- Schmidt, Dietrich and Franz Knipping (1959) "Karl Bücher und das erste deutsche Universitätsinstitut für Zeitungskunde. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte und zur Rolle der bürgerlichen Zeitungswissenschaft". In Engelberg et al. 1959, 57–77.
- Schwabe, Ludwig (1915) *Dorpat vor fünfzig Jahren. Aus den Lebenserinnerungen eines deutschen Professors*. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Seiz, Walter (1955) "Hermann Bücher". In *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 2. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 718.
- Semel, Hugo, ed. (1918) *Die Universität Dorpat (1802–1918). Skizzen zu ihrer Geschichte von Lehrern und ehemaligen Schülern*. Dorpat: Laakmann.
- Semeljanova, I. (1987) "Istorik russkogo prava: F. L. Moroshkin i Gustav Evers". In *Humanitaarteaduste koolkondade, ideede ja teooriate areng Tartu Ülikoolis*. Tartu Ülikooli ajaloo küsimusi, vol. 19. (TRÜ ajaloo muuseumi materjalid). Tartu: University Press.

- Siilivask, Karl (1987) "Über die Rolle der Universität Tartu bei der Entwicklung der inländischen und internationalen Wissenschaft". In Pistohlkors/Raun/Kagbein 1987, 105–122.
- Skalweit, August (1946) "Vorwort des Herausgebers". In Bücher 1944 (2nd edn. 1946), 3–9.
- Stieda, Wilhelm (1906) *Die Nationalökonomie als Universitätswissenschaft*. Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Abteilung der Königlich Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, vol. 25, no. 2, Leipzig: Teubner.
- Stieda, Wilhelm (1915) "Einleitung". In Schwabe, iii–viii.
- Stieda, Wilhelm (1926) *Alt-Dorpat. Briefe aus den ersten Jahrzehnten der Hochschule*. Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Abteilung der Königlich Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, vol. 28, no. 2, Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Süss, Wilhelm (1928) *Karl Morgenstern (1770–1852). Ein Kulturhistorischer Versuch*. Dorpat: Mattiesen
- Thaden, Edward C. (1969) "Manaseins Senatorenrevision in Livland und Kurland 1882–1883". *Jahrbücher für die Geschichte Osteuropas*, 17, 1 (March), 45–58.
- Tiling, W[ilhelm] v. (1906) *Das Leben und Leiden der Deutschen im Russischen Reiche, besonders in den Ostseeprovinzen*. Cassel: Georg Dufayel.
- Tobien, Alexander (1905) *Die Bauernbefreiung in Livland*. Aus den Festgaben für Friedrich Neumann. Tübingen: Laupp.
- Tobien, Alexander (1910) "Ursprung und Lage der Landarbeiter in Livland". *ZgStW*, 66, 156–177, 374–396.
- Tobien, Alexander v. (1930) *Die Livländische Ritterschaft in ihrem Verhältnis zum Zarismus und Russischen Nationalismus*, vol. 2. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Vasar, Jüri (1927) *Carl Schirren ajaloolasena*. *Academicae Societatis Historicae Scripta et Opuscula Estonia*, vol. 4. Tartu: Postimees.
- Veressajev, Vikenti (1971) "Derptis". In *Postitõllaga läbi Eestimaa. Eestimaa vene kirjanike kujutuses (XVIII sajandi lõpp – XX sajandi algus)*. Sergei Issakov, ed. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, 533–551.
- Wagner, Adolph (1864) *Die Gesetzmässigkeit in den scheinbar willkürlichen menschlichen Handlungen vom Standpunkte der Statistik*. Hamburg: Boyes & Geisler.
- Wagner, Adolph (1866a) *Beiträge zur Finanzstatistik des Schulwesens in den Städten des Ostseegouvernements Livland, Kurland und Esthland*. Dorpat: "Als Manuscript gedruckt. / Druck von C. Matthiesen".
- Wagner, Adolph (1866b) "Die auswärtige Politik Rußlands und ihre Bedeutung für Preußen". *Preußische Jahrbücher*, 18, 6 (Dezember), 657–692.
- Wagner, Adolph (1867) "Statistik". In *Deutsches Staats-Wörterbuch*, vol. 10. Leipzig: Expedition des Staats-Wörterbuchs, 400–481.
- Wagner, Adolph (1867–1868) "Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des russischen Agios und Wechselcurses, mit Rücksicht auf den auswärtigen Handel. Eine statistische Studie". *Baltische Monatschrift*, 16 (1867), 6, 487–514, and 17 (1868), 1, 1–37.
- Wagner, Adolph (1868a) "Zur Lösung der russischen Valutafrage". *Baltische Monatschrift*, 17 (1868), 5, 361–402, and 6, 473–532.
- Wagner, Adolph (1868b) *Die russische Papierwährung. Eine volkswirtschaftliche und finanzpolitische Studie nebst Vorschlägen zur Herstellung der Valuta*. Riga: Kymmell.
- Wagner, Adolph (1887) "Finanzwissenschaft und Staatssozialismus, mit einer Einleitung über Stein's und Roscher's Finanzwissenschaft". *ZgStW*, 43, 37–122, 675–746.
- Wagner, Adolph (1892) *Grundlegung der politischen Ökonomie*. Part 1, vol. 1. 3rd edn. Leipzig: Winter.
- Wagner, Adolph (1895) *Die akademische Nationalökonomie und der Socialismus*. Rede zum Antritt des Rectorats der Königlich Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität in Berlin. Berlin: Julius Becker.
- Wagner, Adolph (1948) *Finanzwissenschaft und Staatssozialismus*. August Skalweit, ed. Frankfurt/Main: Klostermann. [New edn. of Wagner 1887.]

Wagner, Adolph (1978) *Briefe – Dokumente – Augenzeugenberichte, 1851–1917*. Heinrich Rubner, ed. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.

Wer ist's? (1928) 9th edn. Berlin: Degener.

Wittram, Reinhard (1964) "Die Universität Dorpat im 19. Jahrhundert". In Walter Hubatsch et al. *Deutsche Universitäten und Hochschulen im Osten*. Köln – Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 56–86.

"Ein Wort über die Universität Dorpat und ihre Schüler". (1872). *Baltische Monatsschrift*, 3(21), 514–528

Wright, H.R.C. (1993) "Adolph Wagner and the Plural Society". *The South African Journal of Economics*, 61, 1, 59–66.

ZgStW = *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft*.

Zwiedineck, Ø v. (1930) "Gedenkworte, gesprochen von Professor von Zwiedineck in der Vorlesung an der Universität München". In *Zum Gedächtnis von Karl Bücher. Gestorben den 12. November 1930*. [Leipzig: s.l.,] 4–11.