

REVIEWS

Acta Poloniae Historica
102, 2010
PL ISSN 0001-6892

Almut Bues, *Die Apologien Herzog Albrechts*, Wiesbaden, 2009, Harrassowitz Verlag, 373 pp., series: Deutsches Historisches Institut Warschau, Quellen und Studien, 20

I think that it will not be without a certain degree of embarrassment that historians of Polish-Prussian and Polish-German relations in the sixteenth century take to hand this publication of the German Historical Institute in Warsaw prepared by Almut Bues. The researcher, known for among other things as being the editor of the many-volume edition of notes of Martin Gruneweg,¹ as well as the author of studies devoted to Courland,² has undertaken a subsequent editorial labour. The present work contains the critical edition of the apologetic texts for the years 1526–34 preceded by a publisher's introduction. Their aim was to explain and justify before public opinion the conversion to Lutheranism, the secularisation of Teutonic Prussia as well as the subsequent legal-political moves undertaken by Albert of Hohenzollern-Ansbach. The mentioned bewilderment is awakened by the bibliographical note visible on the cover and the title page which unfortunately suggests that the reader is dealing with a critical study of documents. In such a work the source text constitutes merely an annex. In my understanding the present volume constitutes, however, a source edition, about which the title page should inform one. This oversight was to be rectified on the publisher's official website (Harrasovitz Verlag), but 'milk had been spilt' and it is rather difficult to not recall this misunderstanding.

The edition of source texts is preceded by a historical introduction in German (pp. 1–18) and Polish (pp. 19–36). That the publisher has taken the trouble to supply the volume with a translation of the introduction into Polish, something that has become the norm for works published by the

¹ Almut Bues (ed.), *Die Aufzeichnungen des Dominikaners Martin Gruneweg (1562 – ca. 1618) über seine Familie in Danzig, seine Handelsreisen in Osteuropa und sein Klosterleben in Polen*, 4 vols. (Deutsches Historisches Institut Warschau, Quellen und Studien, 19,1–19,4, Wiesbaden, 2008). See also *eadem* (ed.), *Martin Gruneweg (1562 – nach 1615). Ein europäischer Lebensweg/ Martin Gruneweg (1562 – after 1615): A European Way of Life* (Deutsches Historisches Institut Warschau, Quellen und Studien, 21, Wiesbaden, 2009).

² *Eadem*, *Das Herzogtum Kurland und der Norden der polnisch-litauischen Adelsrepublik im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert. Möglichkeiten von Integration und Autonomie* (Gießen, 2001).

German Historical Institute in Warsaw, has surely allowed for an increase in the circle of those able to appreciate the work. The editorial part (pp. 55–329) has been divided into two fundamental parts. The first contains the four apologetic writings of the Prussian duke published in German: *Die Christliche Verantwortung* of 1526 (pp. 55–80), *Die Supplik* of 1530 (besides the German version it is equally in a Latin version, pp. 81–130), *Das Libell* of 1531 as well as *Die Apologie* of 1532 (equally in two languages). In the second part are to be found twenty writings-letters as well as two addresses given in defence of Duke Albert from 1526 to 1534. This is equally the correspondence of the duke of Prussia and his collaborators to the emperor, the estates and princes of the Reich, the king of Poland, Sigismund I the Old, as well as equally those addressed to the duke himself, including ones written by Martin Luther, and to the Polish sovereign that was the suzerain of Albert Hohenzollern.

Some of the published sources have been known for a long time in the literature on the subject, about which the editor makes note; they had already been published in old Enlightenment editions of the documents like, for example, the one by Maciej Dogiel (1715–60), the creator of the first Polish diplomatic codex: *Codex diplomaticus Regni Poloniae et Magni Ducatus Lithuanie*,³ or also in present-day works devoted to the history of Prussia in the sixteenth century (e.g. of the pen of Walther Hubatsch). Their assembly as well as commentary is certainly a most positive development.

The figure of Albert Hohenzollern – the grand master of the Teutonic Knights, from 1525 the first secular, Lutheran duke of Prussia (so-called Ducal Prussia) as well as his role in the political and denominational history of Germany and Poland, is as dramatic as it is controversial. Albert's decision to convert to Lutheranism and to secularise the Teutonic state invoked consternation and justified incomprehension amongst his hitherto allies. For example, the Emperor Charles V considered Albert a traitor, ordered him to stand before the Reich Court as well as handing over authority over Prussia to a new Teutonic master. The imperial proscription was to hang over the Prussian duke right up until his death in 1568. National historiographies, German and Polish, to this day are involved in discussions on the consequences of the secularisation of Prussia as well as the Cracow Treaty for the later history of Prussia, Germany and Poland. Respectively there has been undertaken either a stylization of Duke Albert into the creator of Prussia's subsequent might or the presentation of the Prussian Homage as one of the most important moments in the historical consciousness of contemporary Poles.

However, it was already Albert who faced the need to explain to his contemporaries the clear motifs for his behaviour, the need to answer the

³ Available online: <http://sbc.org.pl/dlibra/doccontent?id=4777&dirids=1> (20 Sept. 2009).

maligning addresses directed towards him as well as the published polemic writings (e.g. by Dietrich von Klee, the Teutonic master in Germany). The writings assembled by Almut Bues show the line of defence adopted in diplomacy by the Prussian duke, and first and foremost the means of rationalizing the unexpected political undertaking which was to have both a significant religious and legal dimension. Fairly skilfully in letters, which often the duke himself edited, emphasis is carefully laid on theological questions, criticizing corruption in the Roman Catholic Church, the life of the Order, showing equally the pointlessness of the further existence of the Teutonic state in territories which in the sixteenth century were no longer pagan. There was no absence within the apologies of legal-historical arguments questioning the subjugation of Prussia to the emperor, citing equally obligations to the king of Poland who had forbidden the Prussia duke to stand before the Reich Court. Paradoxically, Duke Albert Hohenzollern in his apologies draws on arguments which the Polish side were to use in the course of its long-standing negotiations preceding the outbreak of war in 1519, for example pointing to the validity of the rulings of the Second Treaty of Toruń [Thorn], of 1466. He also pointed out that in the face of the superiority of the army of the king of Poland he was forced to subjugate himself to Poland for he could not count on assistance from the estates of the Reich. Generally the mentioned polemical texts constitute an extremely interesting example of the argumentation used within the sixteenth-century judicial system of early modern Germany.

From amongst the obligations of a reviewer I would like to draw attention to a certain lapse in correction, this being even more the case given the linguistic care that Almut Bues has made us accustomed to in her previous works. This time one may gain the impression that the work was accompanied by a degree of haste – the worst thing possible in the preparation of source texts – which has resulted in spelling mistakes in both the Polish list of contents (p. V), as equally the main text (see p. 1, footnote 2, p. 8), numerous mistakes in the division of words (the Polish part), as well as not always the best of translation of German terms into Polish. However, this does not reduce the ranking of the edition, which will most surely be referred to by historians of political history as well as by researchers of the beginnings of the reformation and the rhetoric of the political-legal culture of the first half of the sixteenth century.

trans. Guy Torr

Edmund Kizik

Walter Leitsch, *Das Leben am Hof König Sigismunds III. von Polen*, Wien, 2009, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Polnischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und Kunste, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 4 vols., 2861 pp. (the title page also in Polish: Walter Leitsch, *Król Zygmunt III i jego polski dwór* [Kraków, 2009])

The author has written in the introduction that his aim was to present life at the Polish court during the times of Sigismund III Vasa. The Polish title emphasizes the figure of the king himself, while the work is rather about Sigismund III, his family and court or more strictly courts: that of the king and his subsequent wives.

One of the impulses for undertaking the study was, as Walter Leitsch informs us, the discovery in Munich of the letters of Ursula Meyerin who was at the court of Sigismund III and was close to the king and his subsequent wives. This initiated a full-scale search of archives and libraries in Austria, Belgium, Germany, Italy and at the Vatican, Poland, Russia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom (there is a curious lack of enquiry into Lithuanian collections). Then came the years of ordering the materials and the process of writing. The author was, unfortunately, not to live to see the publication of his work.

The work is divided according to problem areas, although at times a different sequencing of the matters under consideration would aid the reading process. The first volume is devoted to the king's incomes and expenditures, those of his wives Anne and Constance of Austria as well as, as one of the subchapters announces, 'other members of the family'. This fragment of the book discusses, and here merely in brief, the finances of only Anne Vasa, Sigismund III's sister and Ladislas, the eldest of the princes to have become of age. The data on incomes and expenditures for several years is presented in tables. It results from these that, among other things, at the beginning of the reign, for in 1588, expenditure came to 236,590 *zloty*, while in the final year of Sigismund III's life it was almost double at 439,812 *zloty*. It does follow to note, however, that the second listing contains more items including the pay for 100 foot soldiers of the marshal, employed to keep order wherever the court found itself (*Fußsoldatendes Marschallamtes*). Something that is worthy of note as it provides information as to the financing of this office.

The remaining part of the volume is taken up with a discussion on the structure and make-up of the king's and successive queens' courts. In accordance with the title of the work there is an absence of description of the Swedish court of Sigismund Vasa as well as of those of Anne Vasa and Ladislas. This would not have really been noticed if the author had not written earlier about their incomes.

The second volume brings discussion about various aspects of Sigismund Vasa's person. The king is presented as a *homo politicus* (it is a surprise that only in the next subchapter ['Sigismund and his family'], does the author write about his childhood). Then there is a subchapter ['Sigismund als Person'], in which Leitsch describes the king's appearance, his character, life style, religiosity ('he wanted to be and was tolerant', p. 741), likes and phobias. In a separate subchapter the extra-political sphere of the king's life is described, including education, interests (music, art), court ceremonies, hunting. The chapter ends with a discussion on the king's health right up until his death. The remaining part of the volume is devoted to the two Annes, the king's sister as well as his first wife, which may strike one as surprising if one remembers that the author had earlier described his death and then legacy.

The third volume presents the second wife, Constance. Although the marriage to Anne lasted six years while to Constance twenty-six, the author devotes 279 pages to the former and 204 to the latter, with the disproportion increasing if one were to take into consideration the annexes. It does follow to state, however, that the political role of the queens takes up 16 and 36 pages respectively. There is a subchapter about the mother of both queens, Archduchess Mary, although the author only writes about her in relation to her four journeys to Poland and correspondence with her daughters. Next, mainly in brief, Leitsch writes about the royal children – the exception being Ladislav who features on almost 80 pages. The author writes about his childhood, relations with his father, mother, siblings, outlook on life, religiosity and health.

The remaining part of the third volume is given over to a presentation of individuals trusted by the king and queens, within which the author differentiates the close circle, the interior, where for almost 70 pages he writes about the above-mentioned Ursula Meyerin. For a comparison one may add that Kasper Dönhoff, considered to be a royal favourite, is presented on 11 pages. Next Leitsch concentrates his attention on several groups of court officials, though their classification appears the least controversial. For he distinguishes court officials (chiefly Crown and Lithuanian marshals), clergy performing state functions (chancellors and Crown deputy chancellors), secular and ecclesiastic state officials including Crown officials and Lithuanian ones, confidants fulfilling court functions as well as those from the queens' courts. What draws attention is the lack of preachers and confessors, about whom there is something in the chapter on the structure of the court. Finally the author singles out the group of foreigners not in possession of Polish offices and not being in Polish service. Remembering the gentry's accusation that the king surrounded himself with foreigners attention paid to this particular grouping would have been extremely interesting, unfortunately the author mentions a mere five names of highly varied social status: the nuncio Claudio Rangoni, two Swedes (Gustaw Brahe, Lindorn Bonde), a citizen of Gdańsk (Andreas Köne) as well as a Frenchman or possibly, for the matter is not

clear, an Italian (Pierre de Lecole). In addition their role and significance in the king's activities remain little known.

Finally, the fourth volume, in which the author leaves personnel matters and writes about nutrition, meals, furniture and clothes, about jewellery – separately for the king, both queens as well as giving a little information about the jewels of Sigismund's sister and children. There are subchapters about Sigismund III as a collector of, among other things, tapestries and relics; about the court in transit; and another about the court during periods of plague. It follows to separately mention the extremely valuable annexes, amongst which are the composition of Queen Anne's court, an inventory of Anne's wardrobe (from 1597) and of Sigismund III's (1595) as well as an inventory of the king's valuables (undated but as the author supposes from the 1590s).

It leaves us to answer the fundamental question for a piece of academic research as to what Leitsch's books brings to a knowledge of the past that is new.

Generally, *Life at the Court of King Sigismund III* may be divided into two parts. The fundamental part determines that we are dealing with an outstanding work, for the author analyzes matters that have to date not been discussed in historiography or at best merely touched on. Here belong questions on the functioning of the royal court, starting with matters of finance and ending on issues of food, clothing and collections. It does follow, however, to make it clear that besides questions dealt with in detail there are those that have been merely sketched, and even passed over, about which recall should have been made. Here one may mention the questions of the court models which Sigismund III used in creating his own: what was left from his predecessor is unmentioned, what he borrowed from abroad and from Poland, whether and to what degree his court influenced magnate courts. There is a lack of a description of the functioning of the royal chancellery, and the method of judging the perpetrators of misdemeanours and crimes committed at court by the individuals of various social status that made up the court, or merely momentarily being there or committed where the court was residing. Besides, in situations whereby the royal pair were separated – there is a lack of presentation of the legal and customary status of the queen's court and with time that of the princes.

The second part of the work comprises, first and foremost, reflections on the king as a politician, his conflict with Jan Zamoyski, religiosity, a smattering of information on the royal children, or the purchase of the Żywiec estate. This part does not fit into the subject matter of the work, and what is more important does not contain anything significantly new.

In recapping, despite all the limitations of the work and the possibility to debate with the author's judgements, Walter Leitsch's *opus vitae* is an outstanding work. It is rich in facts. It presents matters previously not

researched while at the same time pointing to questions that still require research. It is a work no one writing about Sigismund III can ignore.

trans. Guy Torr

Henryk Wisner

Tobias Schenk, *Wegbereiter der Emanzipation? Studien zur Judenpolitik des "Aufgeklärten Absolutismus" in Preußen (1763–1812)*, Berlin, 2010, Duncker und Humblot, 756 pp., series: Quellen und Forschungen zur Brandenburgischen und Preußischen Geschichte, 39

The study under discussion, impressive in its dimensions, is a shortened version of a doctoral thesis defended at the University of Münster in 2007, entitled: “...gar nicht als Abgabe oder Beschwerde anzusehen?” Untersuchungen zur friderizianischen Judenpolitik im Spiegel ihrer Sonderabgaben (1763–1812).¹ The new title, broader and with it more explicit, points immediately to two facts: firstly the monograph questions the conviction, widespread in works on the subject, particularly those published after the Second World War, that the Frederician era was highly favourable for the ‘emancipation’ of Jewish circles; secondly, parenthesizing the term ‘enlightened absolutism’, the author questions the fundamental view that the Frederician monarchy was *par excellence* an example of the constitutional form referred to as enlightened absolutism. In the first question, to which I will return as one fundamental in the further course of arguments, the author’s views, ones based on convincing documentation, certainly are deserving of attention. In the second question I would like to declare that in the controversies which possess an unusually long history within European historiography, I am of the view that enlightened absolutism was a real, in certain European countries, modernizing and reforming force of the political, social system, *etc.*, which does not, however, change the fact that it was an era full of contradictions.² With such a view of the matter I would not have used inverted commas for defining the Frederician era as a form of enlightened absolutism, which does not have to

¹ We shall add for a full picture that the numerous additional statistical materials constituting an important basis for the work have been placed on the Internet – cf. online publication platform for the institutes of the Foundation of German Humanities Institutes Abroad (DGIA) and their partners: perspectivia.net

² Cf. among other things my texts: ‘Preussen als absolute und konstitutionnelle Monarchie 1701–1871’, *Polnische Weststudien*, vi, 2 (1987), 187–98; ‘Czy istniał oświecony absolutyzm w Europie XVIII w.?’., in Henryk Olszewski (ed.), *Studia z historii ustroju i prawa. Księga dedykowana Profesorowi Jerzemu Walachowiczowi* (Poznań, 2002), 333–46.

lead to excessive expectations in the matter of interest to the author, i.e. the emancipation of the Jewish population. Therefore maybe here a few general remarks about an extremely complicated and multi-layered approach on the part of people of the Enlightenment to the Jewish question would be relevant.

A significant and representative part of publicists and thinkers of the European Enlightenment decisively opposed various forms of legal and economic discrimination of the Jewish population, criticizing often Christian anti-Judaism with its many centuries of tradition in the stereotype defined by religious motifs (though often brought into effect as an expression of concrete socio-economic interests). However, already in matters of practical politics there existed serious differences between the adherents of complete cultural and 'national' assimilation of the Jewish population, and those, in the minority, who wanted to respect the religious and cultural identity of the Jews, simply eradicating forms of discrimination. It is also worth remembering that as a result of economic factors and even anti-clerical civilizational determiners, ones hostile to the model of the typical orthodox way of life within Jewish circles, there equally came into existence an enlightened anti-Semitism, one more and less visible, the protagonist of which was, i.a., Voltaire.³ It is against such a broad background that the contradictions of the era need to be seen, one equally visible in the Prussia of Frederick the Great as in the Polish attempts at Jewish reforms in the day of the Four-Year *Sejm* (1788–92).⁴

The fundamental aim of Tobias Schenk's monograph is the presentation of Frederick the Great's fiscal policy in relation to Jews residing within the Prussian monarchy and a consideration of the consequences of this policy, which underwent a particular intensification for the years 1763–86.⁵ In the

³ I am referring, from amongst the rich material on the topic to a work summarizing the state of research: Bertram E. Schwarzbach, 'Voltaire et les Juifs: bilan et plaidoyer', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, 358 (1998), 27–91. This study presents the fairly clear duality and ambiguity of 'Enlightenment anti-Semitism'.

⁴ Cf. Stanisław Salmonowicz, 'Les Juifs Polonais et la règle "neminem captivabimus nisi jure victum"', in Dariusz Długosz and Jerzy Pielaszek (eds.), *Grecs, Juifs, Polonais. A la recherche des racines de la civilisation européenne. Actes du Colloque international tenu à Paris le 14 novembre 2003, dédié à Joseph Mélèze-Modrzejewski* (Paris and Warsaw, 2006), 194–203, *ibidem* further literature on the subject.

⁵ In the final remarks (p. 625) the author expresses the aim of his work thus: 'Die Arbeit konzentrierte sich dabei auf folgende Aspekte: Art. und finanzieller Umfang der jeweiligen Abgaben, wirtschaftliche, demographische und soziale Auswirkungen dieser Belastungen sowohl auf die Judenschaft als auch auf einzelne Hausväter, Umgang des Königs und der Beamtschaft mit den im Rahmen der untersuchten Abgaben verliehenen Rechtstiteln'.

light of his analyses the author considers the views current in historiography on the subject of the significance of the Frederician era for the fate of Jews in Prussia.

In moving onto short comments on the subject of the rich documentary basis of the work it follows to state that first of all the author has based himself on his own detailed source studies concerning the fundamental subject of the work, that are the forced purchases (so called *Zwangsexport*) of the goods of certain Frederician plants: 1. Templiner Strumpf- und Mützenmanufaktur, 2. the famous Berlin porcelain plant Königliche Porzellan-Manufaktur (KPM). The list of sources and works referred to is indeed truly impressive (pp. 660–728). As far as the archive sources are concerned then, the author has not only made use of the main archive materials of the central Prussian authorities (Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin and a range of provincial archives, including the State Archives [Archiwum Państwowe] in Gorzów Wielkopolski), but first and foremost the rich archive sources of the mentioned Berlin porcelain manufactures so important for the subject matter and a series of archives belonging to Jewish institutions. One may also underline the fact that the bibliography in German is exceptionally painstakingly assembled and could serve as a starting point for any research whatsoever into the situation of the Jewish population for the period from the end of the seventeenth century to at least 1848. It is difficult to hold anything against the author that he has not made use of works in Polish though he does know certain publications on the Polish territories after the First and Second Partition of Poland. The general bibliography on the Frederician era is especially detailed. Hence, though one may mention one or two more or less unfounded omissions, I can on the whole affirm an erudition within the young researcher that inspires respect.⁶

⁶ Out of the obligations imposed on a reviewer I shall list a few titles that were omitted. I am not going to criticize the fact that the author omitted several of the most recent general syntheses like my book in its German translation entitled *Preußen. Geschichte von Staat und Gesellschaft* (Herne, 1995), or Michel Kérautret, *Histoire de la Prusse* (Paris, 2005). One may mention several monographic works like the monograph by Henri Brunschwig, one also significant for Jewish circles, *Gesellschaft und Romantik im 18. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt a.M., Berlin and Wien, 1976), or various works important for the Polish-Prussian borderland and the role of Jews which are mentioned in: George J. Lerski and Halina T. Lerski (eds.), *Jewish-Polish Coexistence: 1772–1939. A Topical Bibliography* (New York, 1986), or Stefi Jersch-Wenzel (ed.), *Deutsche – Polen – Juden: ihre Beziehungen von den Anfängen bis ins 20. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1987). These works do not concern the main current running through the monograph in question but do shed light on the problem of the so-called *Ostjuden* – Jews chiefly from the territories of Poland who according to Frederick II were an economic and civilizational threat. Cf. here also Paul Bräuler, *Nordpommerellen 1772–1910: zwei Kapitel einer dynamischen*

Admittedly there arises a question – in the face of the unusually rich literature on the subject, numbering especially after the Second World War dozens of important titles – as to whether the monograph in question actually brings with it anything new. In anticipating my final conclusions, I am of the conviction that the author – in projecting a detailed source study of the system of the fiscal exploitation of the Jewish population on the picture of general views in relation to the processes of emancipation of Jews in the Frederician epoch – has significantly changed this very picture and has questioned certain general views prevalent in the subject literature. Therefore, from this point of view, we are dealing with a revaluation of the hitherto subject literature.

The construction of the monograph is compact and arouses no reservations. Besides a couple of chapters introducing one to the core subject⁷ as well as a summary and its rich documentation, the fundamental part of the work, the fruit of the author's direct archive engagement, is divided into eight extensive parts (lettered) with the following titles: 'Die zweiten Kinder und ihr jährlicher Manufakturwarenxport von 1763 bis um 1800';⁸ 'Die Templiner Strumpf- und Mützenmanufaktur. Teil 1 (1765–1786)'; 'Zur Porzellanherstellung in Preußen und ihren Problemen'; 'Der Porcellaineexportationszwang. Teil 1 (1769–1779)' (the most extensive part of the work, pp. 260–383); 'Der Porcellaineexportationszwang. Teil 2 (1779–1786)'; 'Ein neuer König in Preußen. Friedrich Wilhelm II. und die gescheiterte Reform des Judenwesens'; 'Aufhebung und Nachleben des Porcellaineexportationszwang'; 'Die Templiner Strumpf- und Mützenmanufaktur. Teil 2 (1786–1812)'.

We shall now ask a question, obviously not for the first time raised in historiography, as to whether Frederick II was an anti-Semite. If we use an extremely broad understanding of this concept, then we would obviously have to include him amongst anti-Semites, for – as the author has forcefully shown – his policy was based on the (relative) support of a certain group of economically strong Jewish circles with the simultaneous clear drive towards the reduction of the number of Jews in Prussia as a whole, and at any rate

Landschaftskunde (Münster, 1996). The role played in Frederick the Great's perception of Jews by the Netzedistrikt post-1772 is known – cf. Willi Wojahn, *Der Netzedistrikt und die sozialökonomischen Verhältnisse seiner Bevölkerung um 1773* (Münster, 1996).

⁷ They discuss among other things the Brandenburg-Prussian policy in relation to Jews from 1671 to 1740 as well as Frederick the Great's policy toward Jews before 1763.

⁸ The concessions given Jews for legal economic operations was bestowed by this privilege on also one son. Hence the obtainment of such rights for a 'second' child required additional concessions and on this was constructed the policy of further burdening Jews with quasi taxes.

maintaining them on a socio-economic margin. This end was served in particular by the methods of impeding the demographic and economic activities of Jews that are described in the monograph. Frederick II himself, in his so-called political testament of 1768 (at the time secret) wrote literally: 'Je n'ai jamais persécuté les gens de cette secte, ni personne, je crois cependant qu'il est prudent de veiller que leur nombre n'augmente pas trop'.⁹ There can be no doubt that Frederick II was not directed by Christian anti-Judaism but both by a certain contemptuous Junker relationship to the stereotypical Jewish trader, by fears of his economic role and also – I underline this on my part – an undoubted civilizational distance, one full of aversion, towards the so-called *Ostjuden*, Jews far from German standards, fully orthodox, and often criticized from enlightened positions.¹⁰ The class society that the Prussia of this era still constituted was composed – if one takes into consideration the amounts of levy for the state treasury – of socially privileged groups, of groups merely recognized in their existence and of groups restrained or discriminated against in one way or another, i.a., through the help of the state's fiscal policy. From this point of view the situation of the Jewish population in Prussia only slightly differed (at least prior to 1763) from the situation in many other German countries, where the rule was a distinguishing between narrow Jewish elites enjoying a certain degree of State protection (so-called *Hoffjuden*, *Hoffakktoren*) and the poor immigrant Jewish masses, which they attempted to eliminate or limit their possibilities for action. One may say that Frederick II's dislike for Jews had clear anti-Semitic features, and yet in his actual policy towards them he was directed chiefly by premises to limit the economic role and demographic development of Jewish circles, while at the same time searching (particularly after the Seven Years War) for clear benefits for the state treasury. Being fairly indifferent to religious questions, Frederick II allowed the Jewish population freedom of action in many areas. However, his policies led to a situation whereby besides a prospering, though relatively narrow (chiefly in Berlin), economic Jewish elite which was able to appease the fiscal demands of this policy, the overwhelming majority of the

⁹ Richard Dietrich (ed.), *Die Politische Testamenten der Hohenzollern* (Cologne, 1986), 506.

¹⁰ Frederick II clearly defined the differences between 'civilized' and wealthy Jews from the lands of the Reich (chiefly the so-called *Schutz-Juden*) and eastern Jews, whom he scorned and feared from the economic as equally the demographic point of view. Strictly orthodox, the low level of personal culture and isolation from Christian societies as well the low level of prosperity defined the constant dislike, right up until the twentieth century, for the so-called *Ostjuden* – cf. generally Stefi Jersch Wenzel (eds.), *Juden und Armut in Mittel- und Osteuropa* (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna, 2000); Heiko Haumann, *Geschichte der Ostjuden* (4th edn, Munich, 1998).

Jewish population – as the author shows – lost development possibilities. Frederick II had nothing against his policy impoverishing these environments or even forcing Jewish families to leave Prussia in a situation where their earning possibilities were unable to cope with the imposed burdens.¹¹

There is no possibility to summarize the author's detailed findings, showing how for the period 1763–86 the fiscal pressure on Jews grew, what methods were here applied and what were the concrete political results, those that could be statistically presented, for the economic and legal situation of the Jewish population within the Prussian state. The legal franchised economic activity of Jews was still based on the possession of the so-called *Schutzbrief*, which authorized a given father of a Jewish family and subsequently one of the sons to conduct such a business. However, for the so-called *zweite Kinder*, i.e. subsequent sons permission for franchised business activities, marriage, etc. was dependent on a type of financial tribute, in the form of so-called coerced purchases of either porcelain from the royal works, with the obligation to export it or also later coerced purchase in the loss-making stockings plant in Templin.¹²

This policy aimed at saving loss making royal plants did not result, despite everything, in sufficient returns. The works at Templin, despite the efforts and pressures exerted, was to remain loss-making. From 1779 there consequently occurred a new, even more severe, course with regard to the Jewish population. At times the forced purchases of Berlin porcelain inflicted on Jewish families constituted a quarter of the entire works' production. The majority of this porcelain was sold rather at a loss by Jewish merchants abroad, the rest remained as useless wares in Jewish homes. The severe economic effects of this policy is displayed in Table 23 (p. 628). The author decisively takes the view that this policy was extremely detrimental for the overwhelming majority of Jewish families, who, as a result of these burdens, were unable to enter into the make-up of the Prussian middle class.¹³

To what degree have the author's findings changed the general picture of the situation of Jews in the day of Frederick II? That is – despite the fact

¹¹ The author rejects the view that Frederick II's anti-Jewish policy was intended for the widespread well-being of society (as F. L. Kroll considered in 2001), however, he has written, that Jews 'hatten dem "Gesamtwohl" zu dienen, sollten jedoch selbst nach Möglichkeit nicht zu sehr daran partizipieren' (p. 635).

¹² The obtainment of the so-called *Schutzbrief* for a 'second child', who could engage in economic activity, was from 1763 conditioned by the annual purchase of manufactured goods to a value of 1,500 thalars. The conditions for the export of these goods by Jewish merchants became from 1768 onwards increasingly difficult.

¹³ On pp. 630–1 the author has conducted an illustrative calculation of the financial burdens of an average rich Jewish family, which as a result turns out to be unable to break into middle class society. After 1779 the number of concessionary licences granted to Jews in the Prussian state fell by 30 per cent.

that the said regulations and financial policies on the part of Frederick in relation to Jews were broadly known – there had dominated in the relevant literature views that continued the claims of the eminent Jewish researcher Selma Stern (1890–1981),¹⁴ who, in her evaluation of the Frederician era, had placed emphasis on the emancipator-cultural successes of the Jewish population. Yet in the author’s opinion, if the journalism of the era expressed tendencies advantageous for Jews, it applied a legal-natural argumentation, for after all the Potsdam tax counsel Richter was closer to realities, who, in 1777, unequivocally emphasized that the authorities had full rights to all the privileges bestowed on Jews ‘... nach dem Nutzen und Erfordernis des Staats abzuändern auch wohl gar aufzuheben’ (p. 636). There is no doubt that in general matters Stern’s book referred to a large degree to the ‘Prussian’ historiography in force in the period prior to the effects of the Second World War, which glorified as a rule the times of Frederick the Great. This had succumbed in the Jewish question to the attraction of the Berlin situation, where a small group of rich Jewish families had played a sizeable role and had gone down in the history of not only Jewish but also German culture.¹⁵ The author in these matters supports the view of Heinz Duchhardt, who emphasized that the privileges of rich cultured Berlin Jews were also limited and above all that

das galt eben nur für eine ganz kleine Schicht von nicht mehr als zwei Dutzend Familien, während die große Masse der preußischen Juden an dieser durch die merkantilistische Wirtschaftspolitik ausgelösten Entwicklung in keiner Weise teilhatte.¹⁶

It is difficult here not to recall that the book by Christian W. Dohm of 1781 demanding Enlightenment reforms, *Über die bürgerliche Verbesserung der Juden*, although dedicated to Frederick II, did not bring about any changes in his policy. A kind of summary of the author’s reflections on the problem as to whether the emancipation of Jews in the Frederician era had any chances are his words: ‘Die Judenpolitik war beim preußischen Staat und seiner Verwaltung also keineswegs in guten Händen’ (p. 644).

¹⁴ Cf. Selma Stern, *Der preußische Staat und die Juden*, 8 vols. (Tübingen, 1962–75).

¹⁵ The successes of Jewish assimilating elites in Berlin were most spectacular and significant for German culture. Hence the image of the salons of Henrieta Herz, Dorothea Veit-Schlegel (Mendelssohn’s daughter) or Rahel Levin masked for many writers the actual results of Frederick the Great’s fiscal-regulating policy.

¹⁶ Heinz Duchhardt, ‘Die Juden’, in Jürgen Ziechmann (ed.), *Panorama der Fridericianischen Zeit. Friedrich der Grosse und seine Epoche. Ein Handbuch* (Bremen, 1985), 568.

The emancipation of the Jews, though something that occurred to a certain degree, was not an achievement of Frederician policy and it is difficult to see in this a precursor to the later decisions contained in the edict of 1812.¹⁷ The author does not negate the successes of the Berlin Jewish elite, he does not negate that to a certain degree this era constituted and witnessed significant successes for certain circles within elitist Jewish circles, those economically strong, creating, among other things, what we would call the Jewish Enlightenment (Haskala), yet demonstrates that these successes enfranchised by the Prussian state occurred at the cost of those, chiefly immigrants from eastern Europe, who had no chance given the reality of Frederick the Great's fiscal policy. In pointing out in this light the numerous contradictions in the historiographical views to date,¹⁸ the author stresses the multifaceted nature of the situation, one which requires reflection, the need to view the situation on the scale of the entire Prussian state.

In considering the results of the work it follows to underline that the author is prone to treat, though he does not reflect on this matter, the Prussian enlightened absolutism of Frederick II as a discursive matter. Such a view point is in no way distant from my own as the author of the Polish biography of Frederick the Great. I am of the view that the enlightened absolutism of Frederick II was indeed a real phenomenon possessing its inherent assets and liabilities. None other than Rousseau formulated the terse dualism of the achievements and figure of the Prussian ruler writing: 'He thinks like a philosopher, but governs like a king'.

When I study certain statements of German-Jewish historiography on the subject of 'Jews and the monarchy of Frederick II', I come to the conclusion that one could advance a hypothesis that the glorification of this era lies in the very fact, so visible after the Second World War, of viewing the Jewish question through the prism of the Third Reich and the Holocaust. This leads to an inclination to idealise the 'Old Prussia' in which, at least after 1815,

¹⁷ The author has taken his reflections up to the famous edict (Emanzipation-sedik) for Jews of 11 March 1812. It is worth remembering, however, that it was still a long road for Jews to full equality in the Prussian state. The edict of 1812 allowed Jews to carry out various professions, have citizenship in local communes, purchase landed property, etc. Yet officer ranks as well as higher positions in the state administration were still barred to Jews. In 1815 the regulations of the edict were not introduced in the Poznań province.

¹⁸ For example, the author of the newest synthesis of Jewish matters in Germany placed emphasis on the fact that the policy of Frederick the Great strengthened Jewish circles in Prussia; cf. Albert A. Bruer, *Aufstieg und Untergang. Eine Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland (1750–1918)*, (Cologne, 2006). In summing up this policy, Schenk has written literally: 'Die letzten Regierungsjahre Friedrichs des Grossen ... waren für einen großen Teil der preußischen Judenschaft Jahre einer massiven und bislang in dieser Form ungekannten Entrechtung' (p. 490).

the role of Germans of Jewish descent was indeed enormous. To a certain degree this current of a return to Prussian mythology was initiated by a special author, as equally motivated by the fate of his own family, that was Hans Joachim Schoeps.¹⁹

The book by Tobias Schenk is an immense research achievement. The author's erudition and the scope within which he has assembled sources is truly worthy of recognition. The book opens the way to increasingly varied approaches to the Jewish question in the Prussia of the eighteenth – nineteenth century.

trans. Guy Torr

Stanisław Salmonowicz

¹⁹ Cf. Hans J. Schoeps, *Preußen. Geschichte eines Staates* (Berlin, 1966). For we know that the Frederician era, full of colour, was also an era full of contradictions and ambiguities in the actions of a king considered to be a 'philosopher on a throne'. Cf. generally Stanisław Salmonowicz, *Fryderyk Wielki* (4th edn, Wrocław, 2006 [1st edn – 1981]); see also Hanna Labrenz, 'Zur neueren polnischen Einschätzung Friedrich des Grossen. Eine Posener oder Thorner Schule?', in Jürgen Ziechmann (ed.), *Friderizianischen Miniaturen 1* (Forschungen und Studien zur Friderizianischen Zeit, 2, Bremen, 1988), 193–206.

Darius Staliūnas, *Making Russians: Meaning and Practice of Rus-sification in Lithuania and Belarus after 1863* (Amsterdam and New York, 2007), XIV + 466 pp., series: *On the Boundary of Two Worlds: Identity, Freedom, and Moral Imagination in the Baltics*, xi

This book by the well-known Lithuanian historian, involved in the history of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Lithuania, constitutes the crowning of his many years of research. Darius Staliūnas is known not only for his numerous source studies published in Lithuanian but first and foremost thanks to works in English, Russian, Polish and German. His academic interests have evolved from a problem area strictly Lithuanian in content towards more general matters. The first works concerned the affairs of the Catholic Church and the history of higher education in Lithuania.¹

¹ Darius Staliūnas, 'Vilniaus vyskupo E. Ropo veiklos pėdsakais (1903–1907)', in *Atgimimas ir Katalikų Bažnyčia (Lietuvių Atgimimo Istorijos Studijos*, vii, Vilnius, 1994), 142–219; *idem*, "'Truputį Lenkas, truputį Vokietis, truputį Lietuvis, o visų pirma katalikas...". Vilniaus vyskupas Edwardas von der Roppas tarp etninių, pilietinių ir konfesinių vertybių', in Egidijus Motieka *et al.* (eds.), *Asmuo: tarp tautos*

Subsequently the historian's interests moved in the direction of an analysis of the situation of the various nations inhabiting the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania. A closing of sorts was the critical studies into the most important problems of the entire region for the period mentioned, including particularly the problem of Russification and the Jewish question in the Western Provinces of the Russian Empire on the eve of the outbreak of the January Uprising of 1863.²

The central question which runs through all of the works and studies is: did the tsarist authorities strive in point of fact for the complete Russification of all the nations inhabiting historical Lithuania in the period after the January Uprising?³ For the main detailed problems concerned the scope of intentions of the tsarist authorities with regard to the idea of unifying Catholics with Orthodoxy as well as matters of introducing the Russian alphabet for the Lithuanian language.⁴

ir valstybės (Lietuvių Atgimimo Istorijos Studijos, viii, Vilnius, 1996), 291–9; cf. *idem*, 'Między wyznaniem a narodowością: szkic o biskupie wileńskim Edwardzie Roppie (1851–1935)', *Borussia*, 16 (1998), 320–6; *idem*, *Visuomenė be universiteto? (Aukštosis mokyklos atkūrimo problema Lietuvoje: XIX a. vidury – XX a. pradžia)* (Lietuvių Atgimimo Istorijos Studijos, xvi, Vilnius, 2000), 216; *idem*, 'Ethnopolitical Tendencies in Lithuania during the Period 1905–1907 and the Conceptions of Revival of the University of Vilnius', *Lithuanian Historical Studies*, i (1996), 97–115.

² *Idem*, "'The Pole" in the Policy of the Russian Government: Semantics and Praxis in the Mid-nineteenth Century', *Lithuanian Historical Studies*, v (2000), 45–67; *idem*, 'Tadeusz Wróblewski a idea kulturalnej autonomii personalnej na Litwie na początku XX w.', in Jan Jurkiewicz (ed.), *Krajowość – tradycje zgody narodów w dobie nacjonalizmów* (Poznań, 1999), 99–107; *idem*, 'Litewscy biali i władze carskie przed powstaniem styczniowym: między konfrontacją a kompromisem', *Przegląd Historyczny*, lxxxix, 3 (1998), 383–401; *idem*, 'Konserwatywna szlachta litewska w połowie XIX w. – kwestia podwójnej świadomości politycznej', in Jerzy Wyrozumski, *Kultura Litwy i Polski w dziejach* (Cracow, 2000), 133–44; *idem*, 'Changes in the Political Situation and the "Jewish Question" in the Lithuanian Gubernias of the Russian Empire (1855 – April 1863)', in Alvydas Nikžentaitis, Stefan Schreiner and Darius Staliūnas (eds.), *The Vanished World of Lithuanian Jews* (Amsterdam and New York, 2004), 21–43; Vladas Sirutavičius and Darius Staliūnas, *Kai ksenofobija virsta prievarta: Lietuvių ir žydų santykių dinamika XIX a. – XX a. pirmojoje pusėje* (Vilnius, 2005); *idem*, *"Žydų klausimas": lietuvoje XIX a. viduryje* (Vilnius, 2004).

³ Darius Staliūnas, 'Did the Government Seek to Russify Lithuanians and Poles in the Northwest Region after the Uprising of 1863–4', *Kritika: Explorations in the Russian and Euroasian History*, v, 2 (2004), 273–89.

⁴ *Idem*, 'Mozhet li katolik byt' russkim? O vvedenii russkogo yazyka v katolicheskoe bogoslužhenie v 60-tych godach XIX veka', in Pol V. Vert [Paul W. Werth], Petr S. Kabytov and Aleksei I. Miller, *Rossiiskaya Imperiya v zarubežnoi istoriografii: raboty poslednikh let* (Moscow, 2005), 570–87; Mikhail D. Dolbilov and Darius Staliūnas, "'Obratnaia Unia": proekt prisoedinenya katolikov k pravoslavnoi cerkvi

Gradually Staliūnas started, following in the tracks of the Russian historian Aleksei I. Miller, to adopt a position towards a detailed distinction between the processes of denationalization, including Russification, introducing the concepts of assimilation and acculturation adopted from English language publications on the changes in national identity in areas subjected to the pressures of denationalization.⁵ He had already earlier been interested in the general problems connected with the relations and distinction between the history of the state (often non-existent) and the history of a nation striving to create or recreate its own state organism.⁶

The book under discussion considers these very questions. Besides a recapitulation of Staliūnas' previous research the book introduces many invaluable new observations and ascertainments and constitutes an attempt to answer the question: what were the real intentions of the Russian government in relation to the particular nationalities of the region? Before we have a look at the conclusions it is worth first outlining the main problems dealt with in the work.

The area of Staliūnas' interests is the territory of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania within its borders post the Union of Lublin of 1569, expanded by the Suwałki guberniya located within the Congress Kingdom of Poland, for it was from here that the impulse initiating Lithuanian national rebirth was to emanate. Equally it was to be this dialect of the Lithuanian language that was to constitute the basis for the creation of the modern Lithuanian literary language.

In not entering into a discussion on the validity of determining these very geographical borders for the area under analysis it does, however, follow to emphasize that at least the southern areas of the Baltic guberniyas (Courland, Lifland and Estland), as well as the Ukrainian guberniyas: Volhynia, Podolia and Kiev, as well as the guberniya of Smolensk occupied an important place

v Rossijskoj Imperii (1865–1866 gody)', *Slavianovedenie*, 5 (2005), 3–34; Michail Dołbiłow and Darius Staliūnas, "Unia mińska" – próba odwrócenia Unii Brzeskiej: projekty przyłączenia katolików do cerkwi prawosławnej w Imperium Rosyjskim (1865–1866), pt 1, *Arcana*, 64–65 (2005), 136–54; *idem*, "Unia mińsko-wileńska" – próba odwrócenia Unii Brzeskiej: projekty przyłączenia katolików do cerkwi prawosławnej w Imperium Rosyjskim (1865–1866)', pt 2, *Arcana*, 79 (2008), 41–61; Darius Staliūnas, 'Identifikacija, yazyk i alfavit litovcev v rossijskoj nacional'noj politike 1860-ch godov', *Ab Imperio* (2005), no. 2, 225–54; Mikhail D. Dolbilov and Darius Staliūnas, 'Vvedenie k forumu "alfavit, yazyk i nacional'naya identichnost'" v Rossijskoj Imperii', *ibidem*, 123–34.

⁵ Darius Staliūnas, 'Assimilation or Acculturation? Russian Imperial Policy toward Lithuanians in the 1860s', *Central and Eastern European Review*, ii (2008), 1–20.

⁶ *Idem*, 'Alternatywa początku XX wieku: historia etnosu czy państwa', *Lituanoslavica Posnaniensia. Studia Historica*, viii (2001), 81–95.

in the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania although in the second half of the nineteenth century they had lost to a large degree their link with the former Polish-Lithuanian state. From the point of view of ethnic influences, thanks to the Polish or Polonized landed gentry there had been preserved, however, certain links with the former lands of the Commonwealth. These links manifested themselves first and foremost in a pro-Polish sympathy and an orientation towards Warsaw or the Cracow of Austro-Hungary.

The main question asked in the work is: what were the aims of Russian ethnic policy beginning with the 1860s? The author singles out the concept of Russification and separates it from the indirect stages of the process of Russification. Following on from the American researcher into the history of Jews inhabiting the so-called Pale of Settlement, Benjamin Nathans, he introduces the terms of assimilation, acculturation and integration.

Assimilation is understood as the process that finalizes the disappearance of a given ethnic group as an individual recognizable element within a given wider society. Acculturation is a form of adaptation of a smaller ethnic group to the society that surrounds it, transforming rather than eliminating cultural and identity differences. In turn integration within a given society may be institutional (e.g. through school), geographical (e.g. through the acceptance of models of everyday life), economic (e.g. connected with the conducting of a given occupation) (p. 2). What is important, acculturation can, though does not have to, lead to assimilation. However, for the tsarist authorities in wanting 'to create new Russians' the directing of various national groups to a state of acculturation or integration constituted the overriding aim. In simplifying the matter, that which we traditionally call Russification was – according to Staliūnas' understanding – a far more complex process and one whose final effect did not always necessarily have to be the denationalization of a given ethnic minority.

In the first chapter, devoted to the administrative borders and ethnic policy, the Lithuanian historian undertakes an analysis of this policy. He starts from the premise that the Russian Empire did not utilize the principle of matching a given administrative area to its ethnic specificity. This was to only occur under the Soviet period. Hence historical Lithuania (the present-day area of Lithuania and Belarus) was treated by the Russian authorities as a part of Russia itself.

The second chapter is devoted to the problems of finding a political ethnic strategy in the early 1860s. The tsarist authorities were already at the time conscious that it followed to separate the Northwestern Krai of the Empire from any influences and links with the Kingdom of Poland. They knew that the Little Russians (i.e. the Ukrainians of the day) if not belonging to Russia would find themselves within the orbit of Polish influences. On the other hand the Russian authorities were also aware that the Lithuanians were an ethnicity different from both Russians as well as Poles (p. 49). Finally

it was decided to strive for a policy of playing out the conflicts between these national groupings, though earlier there had been formulated – particularly in the area of schooling – ideas that were liberal from a present-day perspective.

Already at the beginning of the 1860s there had appeared the term ‘Russification’ (*obrusenie*), although within the relatively liberal atmosphere of the time it should rather be replaced by the term de-Polonization (*raspolachenie*) (the view of the Vilnius governor general, Aleksandr Potapov, pp. 54–5). Gradually, however, the conception of total or partial Russification of the Polish population was becoming victorious. While in relation to the Jewish population the term assimilation was applied – so that this people became less alienated in relation to others, particularly in relation to the Russian (Belarusian) population in the region. Whereas Poles – in the opinion of the tsarist authorities – should be more significantly Russified than Jews (1867, p. 67). Following the collapse of the January Uprising of 1863–4 the Russification of the region became a ubiquitous term in all Russian normative acts on the Northwestern Krai.

The fourth chapter has been devoted to definitions of nationality in the political practice and question of the isolation of ‘them’ from ‘us’. ‘They’ are first and foremost Poles and Jews, while ‘we’ are here first and foremost Russians (read Belarusians) and Baltic Germans. Staliūnas discusses here the questions of the then introduced bans on the obtainment of land by the Catholic gentry, the problems connected with religious persecution, particularly of the Catholic population, as well as also the increased taxation of Poles as a form of repression following the January Uprising and equally the elimination of Poles and Catholics from all administrative posts, including the complete cleansing of education of Polish teachers plus the introduction of *numerus clausus* for Poles at Russian universities. The complete elimination of the Polish teaching staff is described in a most detailed fashion not only in relation to the Northwestern Krai but also in relation to the entirety of the area of the Western Provinces, as well as in three Ukrainian guberniyas. There was simultaneously pursued a policy of limiting the influences of the clergy and the Catholic Church through the promoting of conversion to Orthodoxy. Staliūnas analyzes in detail the first – on the part of the Russian administration – attempts at identifying the Belarusian, Lithuanian and Latvian populations. Which did not change the fact – as he writes – that during the period of Muravyov’s short though bloody governments everyone in Vilnius – including Jews and Orthodox Russians (Belarusians) – considered themselves (and therefore were noted down) as individuals of Lithuanian descent (p. 120).

Jews were referred to with the word *Yevrei*, while the Russian word *Zhid* (Eng. Yid), which had a negative and insulting connotation, was used to describe pro-Polish Jews. It was written at the time that the local orthodox Jews are pro-Polish in their orientations while the younger generation was

already pro-Russian. The former would refer to the Polish Uprising of 1863–4 with sympathy and would often help Poles, at a time when the latter did not participate in it.

The fifth chapter is devoted to denominational experiments: mass conversions to Orthodoxy before and after the January Uprising, their ideological context and the role in these of the local authorities, the changes in denominational policy after 1868. Of course – as the author emphasizes – the forced conversions that occurred amongst the Catholic Belarusian population, while Lithuanians and the Polish-speaking gentry were not an object of mass conversional pressures (p. 158). The author discusses the differences in interpretations of the denominational questions as advanced by Russian and English-language historians who reject the thesis on the permanently negative attitude of the Orthodox Church towards other faiths, as well as Belarusian, Lithuanian and Polish historians in the works of which the thesis is widely present.

Reflections on the question – could a Catholic be a Russian?, as well as the design for a union of Churches, i.e. the joining of the Catholic Church in the Northwestern Krai to the Orthodox Church, conclude chapter five. Detailed problems discussed in this part refer to: religion and language in the first half of the nineteenth century, propagators of ‘Russian Catholicism’ and their programme, the ‘Vilnius clericals’ and the ‘de-Polonization of the Church’, as well as the decree of 1869 on the introduction of Russian to the services of foreign denominations. The most important is the fragment on the project for a union of the Churches, i.e. the idea of joining, or incorporation of the Catholic Church within the Orthodox Church (pp. 180–8). This project, which enjoyed the support of certain local Russian civil servants, was also to find advocates on the Polish-Lithuanian side (Adam Honory Kirkor). It did not come into being, however – as the author notes – as a result of fears of the reaction of the Apostolic See on the part of the tsarist authorities. On the other hand the Russian authorities viewed unfavourably the initiative which had come from Catholic circles for, as they thought, preventing the total liquidation of the Catholic Church in the Russian Empire. We shall recall that the concordat – concluded in the 1840s under Tsar Nicholas I – was broken already in October 1866.

The sixth chapter, which is the final and biggest, has been devoted to the metamorphoses and changes in Russian policy over language. The problem areas contained are: the elimination of Polish from public life, the policy towards Polish books (including primers in Polish but written using the Cyrillic alphabet), the compulsory introduction of Russian to Jewish schools, the question as to the language Jews prayed in (the *Mishnah* in Russian and Hebrew), and also the changes in Ivan Kornilov’s viewpoints (one of the leading Russian civil servants responsible for Russification and Muraviev’s right-hand man) on the Jewish question. Staliūnas describes in detail the

creation of state Jewish schools in the empire – something that was relinquished as a last resort when it was decided that Jewish children would learn together with Christian children in ordinary state schools.

The subsequent parts of the sixth chapter are devoted to the unsuccessful attempts to introduce Cyrillic as the alphabet for Lithuanian and an instrument of assimilation, the organization of country schools in the Kovno (Kaunas) guberniya, the fate of the Protestant parish schools within historical Lithuania. The author describes also at length the problems connected with the status of Belarusians reflecting on whether there had been a ban on the publishing of books in Belarusian as well as attempting to define the place of Belarusian in elementary schools. In the conclusion the author writes:

While at the very beginning of the 1860s bureaucrats within the Russian Empire and influential Slavophiles discussed various projects for a policy of ‘divide and rule’, including support for the ethno-cultural strengthening of other non-dominant national groups (Ukrainians and Belarusians as well as Lithuanians) as a method of achieving their anti-Polish policy, after 1863 such projects were no longer of interest to the central authorities, or local officials in the North-western Provinces (p. 297).

From the moment of post-uprising repression not only Poles who had been responsible for the rebellion were to be punished. Lithuanians, as ‘potential Poles’ should also be punished. Protestants were considered to be ‘silent rebels’ (earlier they had been considered to be allies of the empire) only slightly less active than the ‘obvious rebels’, i.e. the Poles.

Followers of Judaism were not subjected to quite the same repression as Catholics. This was the case only because the Russian authorities considered the position of the Jewish population to be ambivalent – neither too loyal in relation to the Russian authorities nor too openly hostile in relation to the empire. The author also underlines that a tremendous amount depended on whether the decision was taken in Vilnius or in Saint Petersburg.

Consequently Staliūnas rejects the fairly popular thesis so far that Russian ethnic policy was a monolith. He considers, as he illustrates in his book, that it was fairly varied in very many respects. In addition he claims that if one were to compare the policy of the Romanovs with that conducted in other monarchies and multiethnic states the differences would not be, in point of fact, very great. He draws attention to the fact that the Catholic peasants were considered to be ‘potential Poles’ if not Poles *tout court* (p. 300). Those who converted from Catholicism to Orthodoxy (including former priests) were not worthy of the authorities’ trust (they were considered forced converts).

The author perceives many similarities in the policy towards Poles and that conducted in relation to Jews. It was considered that Russian had a good chance of becoming the ‘native’ language of Jews for the jargon (Yiddish) had

no future, while Hebrew was a dead language one known only to rabbis. The repression after the Uprising of 1863 did not change the situation of Jews much but it did open up numerous wounds. In the last resort, following a period of propagating the idea of assimilation of the Jewish population of the empire, the concept of their segregation from the Christian population was to become victorious in the 1880s.

One may see varied ethno-political strategies in relation to the Lithuanian population: from supporting a policy of de-Polonization, through supporting a policy of close relations, to the idea of joining Catholic Lithuanians to Orthodoxy. All of these concepts were a means on the open route to an integration of Lithuanians (i.e. linking them with the Russian state through the assumption that they could not be totally assimilated in any case).

There were no doubts in the case of the Belarusian population: Belarusians were after all Russians in the popular view of things. There was consequently a ban on the publication of Belarusian texts in the Latin alphabet (1859) and then also following the 1863 Uprising a ban on publishing anything whatsoever in this language (although formally such a ban did not exist). However, even in the case of Belarusians a lack of financial means and state funds meant that this policy was not consistent and uniform.

Making Russians is an exceptionally soundly written monograph, one based on unique source materials and one that significantly enriches the existing works on the process of Russification, including the irreplaceable monograph by Theodore Weeks *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia*.⁷ There is no possibility within the confines of a review to honour those ascertainments which are completely new and those which supplement our knowledge to date about certain facts and phenomena. For there are a sizeable number of such ascertainments within a series of questions both detailed as equally general. This is the first monograph for a long time that so thoroughly presents Russian policy in relation to various ethnic groupings, including Poles and people identifying themselves with Polishness, in Lithuania and Belarus during the difficult period of repression that followed 1863. One of the main currents that runs through the book under review is the question of the history of education. For it was school and educational policy that was one of the most important instruments for introducing changes within the direction of assimilation and the integration of numerous ethnic minorities within the multi-national mosaic of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania – integration with Russian culture and integration with the rest of the Russian Empire.

trans. Guy Torr

Leszek Zasztowt

⁷ Theodore R. Weeks, *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia: Nationalism and Russification on the Western Frontier, 1863–1914* (DeKalb, 1996).

Pascal Trees, *Wahlen im Weichselland. Die Nationaldemokraten in Russisch-Polen und die Dumawahlen 1905-1912*, Stuttgart, 2007, Franz Steiner Verlag, 448 pp., series: Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des östlichen Europa, 74

The work under review is devoted to National Democracy (ND) in former Congress Poland at the beginnings of the twentieth century. This is a PhD work of a young historian connected with the University of Bonn, awarded the prize for the best work on 'Polish studies' in Germany for 2006. The author deals here with an area that has so far not found sufficient reflection in the literature on the subject. The book depicts the political landscape of the years between the 1905 Revolution and the last elections in the *Privislinskiĭ Kraĭ* (Vistula Land), to the Fourth Duma in 1912, that is the times when there appeared the first forms of legal Polish politics within the Russian Empire. The monograph is comprised of twelve large chapters presented in chronological order. As is understood the rhythm of the work is subordinated to the course of the elections to the Dumas conducted in Congress Poland. The study is concluded with a short though substantial and instructive summary.

The book is based on extensive archive research (first and foremost into the documentation left after the governor generals, police documentation, and that of central and local organs of the Russian administration) as well as making use of the press of the epoch. The archive documentation, considering its varied degree of preservation, has been utilized in an exemplary way. For certain one of the advantages of the work is the painstaking recreation of the facts of the period. As is shown by the book there is, as far as the matter concerns the first years of the twentieth century, by no means too much on the subject. This is probably the first attempt, within the relevant subject literature, at a meticulous application of the Polish local press for historical ends (despite the fact that it is widely available, this equally being the case in Polish libraries, it had not previously been so fundamentally examined either by foreign or Polish researchers). A certain shortcoming of the work is the fact that the nationalist press has been utilized to a lesser degree than might have been expected. One of the most important attributes of National Democracy in Congress Poland was the creation, one that was possibly the most effective in this region, of a propaganda apparatus in the form of a developed press concern. With Polish literature on the subject this is a topic fairly well described (including the numerous studies by Urszula Jakubowska and Jerzy Kmiecik), while the author's argumentation would have certainly gained much if separate considerations of this problem had been included.

In this appraisal it is worth concentrating on those questions which are less well known in the extensive literature on the subject. Their appearance and presentation in a new form is the effect of not only the analysis

conducted by the author of the assembled sources but equally his approach to the research problem in question. An interesting methodological measure is the reversal of the hitherto dominating cognitive perspective within the research of this period. Trees shifts the centre of gravity from the somehow intuitively accepted premise that both the short- and long-term aim of the Polish groupings of the time was either fighting for independence or social revolution,¹ on to the current activities and their legal forms within which the majority of Polish political formations post-1905 were involved. This teleological assumption that the pinnacle of the collective convictions of the politicians of the day was either national sovereignty or revolutionary utopia has more than once shrouded the actual factual image of Polish politics of this period. Historians of the First World War have for a long time now convinced us that the outbreak of this conflict was in essence an event of chance and the result of a series of numerous coincidences, the pre-war order did not have to crash like a house of cards, and the nation states, in the form they adopted post-1918, were in no way a historical necessity. National historiographies, in particular those in eastern Europe, still are unable, however, to offload the baggage of an approach where politics is explained in terms of purposiveness. The sterile debate on so-called 'orientations' constantly resurfaces in not only historical political commentary but also in works of an academic pretention though for a long time this has brought little or completely nothing to a better understanding of the period.

In accordance with the widely held view, the might of National Democracy in the first decade of the twentieth century was grounded in its influences amongst the wealthy rural populace (the landowners, the intelligentsia and, first and foremost, the peasants). Trees reminds us that this was not a chance act, but the result of long-term, extensive and above all centralized formation work, which this camp, already from its very inception, had conducted amongst the peasantry. Of interest, and something that appears to require further more detailed and with it regional research, is the author's thesis that the nationalist grouping was weakly located in towns, including in large centres like Warsaw and Lodz. As opposed to the broad and comprehensive propaganda directed to rural groupings, the town was, at least during the initial period, neglected. This state of affairs is all the more intriguing given that National Democracy together with its sister organizations dominated the political life of Congress Poland after 1905.

Trees' work clearly shows that during the initial phase National Democracy constituted a fairly varied conglomeration of interest groups. The presentation on the extensive documentary material of dissimilar circles, from which the

¹ Cf. the noted book in its day: Stanisław Kalabiński and Feliks Tych, *Czwarte powstanie czy pierwsza rewolucja: lata 1905–1907 na ziemiach polskich* (Warsaw, 1969; 2nd edn – 1976).

ND activists were recruited, proves that in the first phase of its activities the grouping was rather more a confederation of opposition in relation to the revolution of 1905 than it was a coherent group joined by a common world outlook. This is emphasized still further by the narrative treatment employed by the author, who has smashed the exposition, at the same time following the development of incidents in the 'metropolis' (i.e. chiefly within the Polish Circle at the Dumas) as equally in the provinces. In the wider plane Trees' work is an important contribution in comprehending the route taken by the grouping of intellectual radicals in order to create a modern mass party from ND.

The first two chapters depict the historical and socio-political background of the National Democracy's establishment at the turn of the twentieth century. Here there are many valuable, particularly for a German reader, reminders, not that they bring with them much that is new to the subject literature. An important achievement of the work is, however, the presentation of the process of creating a mass political party outside of the main centres, in the provinces, ably capturing the portraits of the political activists, the first, often teething forms of politicalness. Existing works and studies from this period, chiefly by Polish authors, were of a monographic character, extremely rarely expanding beyond one or two urban centres and beyond stereotypical interpretative schemes. While Trees shows that within the course of a few years all the elements of the nationalist programme had started to arrange themselves into a coherent and logical construction. This was not, however, the effect of the imposing of some vision or other but rather the result of internal arguments. Nonetheless the leading role fell here to Roman Dmowski, whose political journalism, of a unanimous purport from the start of the twentieth century, contained a moderately cohesive worldview.

This coherent project linked with an open political programme, one constantly subjected to fluctuations, turned out to be a considerable advantage, while the tactics of the nationalist right were elastic. The grouping – and particularly its nerve centre with the Central Committee of the National League and Dmowski at its head – did not bind itself with permanent allies, engaging in alliances summarily and for a short period, ably through this eliminating competitors and occupying their places: the clerical Catholic Union – an informal representation of the priesthood; the conservative-bourgeois Party of Real Politics; the factional circles of progressive democracy. Trees' study shows that nationalist circles, let us add ones rich in the experience brought from Galicia, entered into the political scene of Congress Poland as the best prepared, the quickest in adapting to the political reality post-1905; a reality – as Robert Blobaum once stated – of an intense democratization of political culture. Often, however – as the author emphasizes – this was a strength and resilience resulting from the weakness of opponents. Both the rivals

on the right in the form of the indigenous version of political Catholicism and the liberal conservatives from the Party of Real Politics, turned out in these battles to be outmoded, presenting themselves more as a type of fringe political party than as modern electoral machines.

The work of the German researcher shows how a huge expanse of the social life of the first years of the twentieth century remains unknown, while a cleverly constructed catalogue of research questions helps one arrive at many earlier disregarded, forgotten or passed over problems in the formation of politics of a new type within the Polish territories. There is still a long way to go for balance on this period. While certain shortcomings in the work derive from the author's weaker knowledge of the nuances of Jewish political life after 1905 and its influence on the ND rhetoric of the first decades of the twentieth century. The studies of the recently deceased Polish researcher, Mieczysław Sobczak, suggestively prove that for a long time before the First World War National Democracy had entered into the world of mass politics in principle with a formulated anti-Semitic rhetorical tradition.² Trees rightly supposes that the so-called 'Jewish question' was *de facto* an ideological construct, having little in common with the actual behaviour and social and political attitudes of Jews. It would be, however, interesting to trace, even if only on the rhetorical level, what type of argumentation and narrative measures the ND political journalism and propaganda derived from the 'Jewish street'. Trees shows that the initially moderate – for the socio-political reality of Congress Poland – National Democracy programme on the 'Jewish question' (i.e. the assimilation of individuals at the price of unconditional support for the 'national' programme, with a certain distancing from the militant Judophobia characteristic for clerical circles) in the course of a few short years had become an instrument for fighting any opposition. The author correctly recalls that aggressive anti-Semitic rhetoric in its ND form was not simply a handy instrument in the mobilization of its own ranks and a panacea for the loss of electorate but that it was also an instrument in the blackmailing and combating of political opponents as well as its own form of surrogate positive political programme. The elimination of the Jewish population from Polish public life – according to the enunciations of the ND ideologists – was to be a remedy for the numerous, often conflicting interests of social groupings (p. 391).

In a somewhat more superficial way is the author's treatment of the problem of the elections of 1912, about which in both Polish as well as foreign subject literature a lot has been already written (recently Stephen D. Corsin, Jerzy Jedlicki, Robert Blobaum, Theodore R. Weeks, and possibly

² Mieczysław Sobczak, *Narodowa Demokracja wobec kwestii żydowskiej na ziemiach polskich przed I wojną światową* (Wrocław, 2007); *idem, Stosunek Narodowej Demokracji do kwestii żydowskiej w latach 1914–1919* (Wrocław, 2008).

the most thoroughly Konrad Zieliński). Yet the practical and symbolic effects of the boycott action following the election to the Fourth Duma still remain unknown, as well as its scope, frequency and forms within Congress Poland. While it is known that, with less or greater success, the ND press concern strove to popularize its methods and to apply its propaganda practices in other partition areas and territories inhabited by Poles. It is worth drawing attention to this problem for this pre-war wave of anti-Semitism preceded an escalation in anti-Semitic excesses in the Polish territories at the end of the First World War and on the threshold of independence. As it appears the German author, for whom it is difficult to deny research perseverance in the reaching of new sources, as well as the sketching out an extensive and ambitious research plan, has no interest in this question. One could also expect from a foreign researcher that in a monograph concerning the grouping of the Polish nationalist right there would be somewhat more considerations of a comparative nature, or against the wide European backcloth at least something of a central European character, or further that of the Russian political scene, of which Congress Poland was an integral part. When all is said and done, besides Vienna (of the epoch of Karl Lueger, 1897–1910), Congress Poland was the only such case in the region where political anti-Semitism was so strong and constantly polarized the local political scene.

In summarizing there has come to the literature of the subject a methodologically freshly framed monograph that casts a lot of new light on the realia of the Polish political scene at the turn of the twentieth century, as well as providing carefully assembled documentation to the description and analysis of the Polish political scene at the beginnings of the twentieth century. It verifies many detailed judgements present within the copious literature on the subject as well as pointing to new research directions into the mass society developing in the Polish territories. The author has done an enormous amount of documentary and analytical work, and has moved carefully around a fairly complex problem area. The work's merit lies rather in its detailed, at times almost pedantic, analyses and broad discussion with the subject literature as well as with the sources, than in courageous hypotheses and effective conclusions. For at times there is absent in this disciplined exposition any kind of wider view on a general Russian context. The researcher has, however, proved his ability to raise problems and find answers for them and it is this that is surely the work's greatest asset. Thanks to this there has arisen an original study into the history of the political beginnings of the twentieth century. Doubtless this is also one of the most important works to have been published in recent years into National Democracy at the turn of the twentieth century. Of immense help in using the book are the carefully compiled indexes, the competently arranged multilingual bibliography and the impeccable academic methods employed. Trees' book – in the author's inten-

tion one of an analytical rather than synthetic and cross-sectional nature – is a study showing what devastation was caused within the social and political life of Congress Poland by the domination within it of the nationalist right.

trans. Guy Torr

Grzegorz Krzywiec

Jan Kieniewicz (ed.), *Inteligencja, imperium i cywilizacje w XIX i XX wieku* [Intelligentsia, Empire and Civilizations in the 19th and 20th Centuries], Warszawa, 2008, Instytut Badań Interdyscyplinarnych “Artes Liberales” Uniwersytet Warszawski, 309 pp.

The book is the aftermath of the international conference which took place in Warsaw from the 21st to 23rd of June 2007 and which was a part of the research project ‘The Silent Intelligentsia: a Study into Civilisation Violence’ that ran for the years 2006–8 at the Centre for Studies on the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe at the University of Warsaw (today the Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies “Artes Liberales” at the University of Warsaw). The aim of the conference was an acquaintance with the phenomenon referred to as silence,

contemplation of circumstances – as Jan Kieniewicz writes in the introduction – in which the intelligentsia did not fulfil the tasks that they themselves had set; when, why and how they did not achieve the standards they had set themselves – for they could not, did not want to or simply were unable to do so (p. 7).

The conference participants on the one hand discussed the events and situations of individuals defined as intelligentsia in the nations belonging to the Russian Empire and later the Soviet Union while on the other hand – for comparison – they presented the lot of the intelligentsia in distant areas, i.e. under colonial rule from the beginning of the nineteenth up to the second half of the twentieth century. The presentation of such separate experiences is far from accidental for it shows

in what way educated circles managed in various subjugated societies with a discrepancy between their own tradition and the message resulting from the education received (p. 8).

The common feature in all cases was the presence of empire, while the researchers’ intention was to discern those similarities and differences in the reactions of the subjugated societies.

The editor of the volume grouped the articles into three thematic blocks [‘Experiences of speaking and silence’; ‘Experiences of nations on the

peripheries', 'Imperial and colonial experiences']. In the first were grouped texts that directly related to the problem of silence or its opposite. This block opens with an article by Joanna Kurczewska ['Three sociological looks at the Polish intelligentsia and its dilemmas'] relating to the years 1945–89. The author proposes her own approach to the dilemmas of the Polish intelligentsia during the period of totalitarianism – her own 'private research manifesto' (drawing inspiration from various theoretical and empirical sources). Emphasis is placed on utilizing sociological works from various periods of communist rule, and also the need to incorporate three theoretical viewpoints: from the structural-historical perspective, from the perspective of collective identity, as well as from the perspective of individual identity.

Daniel Beauvois ['The unsilent Polish intelligentsia of the western borderlands of the Russian Empire in the nineteenth century'] emphasizes that the Polish intelligentsia on the so-called Taken Lands or Western Krai (the territories of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth annexed to Russia, not comprising Congress Poland) right up until the First World War – despite an intensive policy of Russification on the part of the Russian authorities – did not let themselves be 'silenced', hence assimilated. Of course this was a small group, weak, with difficulties in development yet regardless perceived as dangerous (as a result of their tendency for conspiracy) both by the Russians and by the Polish aristocracy which attempted to ensure itself participation in authority. The reaction of the Russian state to the non-conformism of the intelligentsia was the use of mass national persecution. A ban on the use of the Polish language, the closing of Polish universities, associations and publishing houses can be treated as a form of imperial violence. The matter was obvious, Poles preferred an education *à la russe* than none at all. The uprooting of Polishness from minds was not an easy matter – family life was, after all, conducted in Polish. Russian imperialism in relation to Poles in the former borderlands of the Commonwealth also never took on the form of colonialism – there was no Polish 'people' there was only the Polish nation, i.e. the gentry which had gained more than once the acknowledgement of the Russians. Poles and Russians were in rivalry to subordinate to themselves the Lithuanian, Belarusian and Ukrainian peoples – particularly the forcing on Poles of a sharing of political power over these 'souls' can be, in the author's opinion, considered a triumph of Russian imperialism.

The article by Maria Krisan' ['The shaping of the peasant intelligentsia in Congress Poland in conditions of imperial domination'] shows that the intelligentsia of Congress Poland fulfilled the social duties set before it. The author discusses the process of shaping the peasant intelligentsia (readers of the press for the 'people', enlightened and progressive individuals and through this distinguishing themselves in their environment) in the period from the beginning of the 1880s until the outbreak of the First World War. She presents the problem of the Russification of primary schooling, the

question of the access to education as well as also the possibilities of achieving it outside of a government school. The last question is closely connected with the initiatives undertaken with the idea of rural modernization by higher social strata, particularly by the intelligentsia originating from there. It was they that advanced ideas for setting up lending libraries and reading rooms for the ordinary people, published primers, and also a press for the 'people' (its analysis constituted the source basis for the article under consideration). 'Contact with this press was a breakthrough in the reading biography of the peasants' – the author underlines. By means of the press the peasants not only obtained information about their immediate environment and from the world but they were also able to contact with others, exchange views, advice (thanks to the correspondence section) not to mention the possibility to practice reading. The creators of the journals for the 'people', by means of an ordinary information service and articles on simple subjects, were able to force their propagated models of behaviour, attempted to influence peasant thinking, modernizing it and increasing progressiveness in the countryside. The influence of the peasant press was to be especially influential in the period of Revolution 1905–7. Obviously neither the possibility of educating oneself nor contact with the printed word was to eradicate traditional peasant culture, nonetheless it significantly increased the horizons of rural consciousness.

Margarita Boronova ['From the history of the pre-revolutionary Buryat intelligentsia'] illustrates the significance of education obtained in schools (first in schools founded by the so-called *datsans*, i.e. Buddhist monasteries, subsequently in 'Mongolian schools' and finally in Russian schools) for the process of forming the Buryat intelligentsia. Thanks to the possibilities of being educated in situ these people acquired the achievements of European culture while not losing contact with their homeland. This allowed them to play a specific role in the formulation of slogans of national rebirth, in the preservation of national traditions. The author sketches the history of this social stratum – obviously conditioned by the internal policy of the Soviet empire – right up until the period immediately before the outbreak of the Second World War.

This part of the book is concluded by Andrzej Tymowski's article ['Intelligentsia strategies: keeping faith or keeping silent?'] – an attempt at showing that sometimes the silence of the intelligentsia should be recognized as a well-thought out strategy. The author uses here the example of Czechoslovakia. He discusses the only significant attempt at resistance to the communist regime in the 1970s and 1980s – the setting up of Charter 77 as well as the reaction to it from the side of the so-called 'grey sphere'. He also recalls events from Polish history – the creation of the Komitet Obrony Robotników (Workers' Defence Committee).

The second thematic block concentrates on the experiences of the intelligentsia as formed on the peripheries of empire. Anton Ivanenko ['Intellectuals

in the contemporary northern Caucasus: after the period of “silence”] shows that during the existence of the Soviet Union the intellectuals found themselves in a situation of ‘silence’ or limited possibilities for the articulation of problems of national history. This resulted in a deformation within the group of intellectuals, the consequences of which became apparent after the fall of communism. The crumbling of the Soviet system liquidated the ideological control on the part of the authorities, creating conditions favourable for the intelligentsia to make themselves heard. Unfortunately by that time this group was not capable of this – it found itself under the influence of the new nationalist-political elites of the republics of the eastern Caucasus (joining in the fight for borders): they served the political interests of these groupings, formulated the versions of national history they needed.

Zoja Morochojewa [‘The silent intelligentsia and the Russification of cultural models in Central Asia’] underlines the significance of civilization autonomy for the formation of an intelligentsia. Buryat-Mongolians, despite persistent attempts to Russify them, have persevered their own tradition, religion, language, and first and foremost consciousness of national identity. Not without significance here was the treatment of this community as a periphery environment, and with it a limitation of contact with Russians, an impeding of access to education. This resulted in an increased openness on the part of the Buryats to the influences of other peripheries including Polish (many Poles found themselves in Central Asia as exiles) – hence the persistent drive towards political independence. Only the policy of the Soviet Union ‘silenced’ the Buryat intelligentsia.

Yegor Antonov [‘Discrimination of the Yakutia intelligentsia in the years 1920–1930’] shows that the Soviet authorities first of all began with an elimination of the local intelligentsia. The Yakutia intelligentsia had become troublesome as it had started to proclaim demands for equal treatment for its republic with those comprising the USSR. The discriminatory policy of the Soviet authorities seriously distorted the national identity of the Yakuts, there evaporated from the intelligentsia’s mentality the ideology of national rebirth, and a new type of Soviet specialist of the Stalinist era was fashioned.

Barbara Stępniewska-Holzer’s article [‘The nineteenth-century Jewish intelligentsia in the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth’] is devoted to the conditions of educating the title group, taking into consideration the differences between the partitions. The modern Jewish intelligentsia attempted to fulfil its role through acculturation (absorption of the accomplishments of European culture, the rejection of custom and linguistic differences) and assimilation. Unfortunately Polish society, in a similar way to the majority of European societies, rejected assimilating Jews. The majority of Jews also cut themselves off from them, pursuing the development of their own culture. As an effect the modern Jewish intelligentsia remained an alienated group within central and eastern Europe.

This part of the book is closed by the article by Jan Kieniewicz [‘Career or betrayal? An educated Pole crosses the borders of civilization’]. The author here undertakes an attempt to answer the question as to whether the choice of career taken by a Pole inhabiting the Western Krai was comparable to a rejection of the system of values professed by the subjugated society, i.e.: whether it was equal to a crossing of the so-called civilization border. The conditions in which Polish society was to live in the western guberniyas, are described by the author as ‘civilization violence’:

A Pole had to gain an education and accept work in a language and under conditions imposed not only by the state but also by people operating within a separate value system (p. 216).

However, in so far as an educated Pole did not enter into the circle of the Russian intelligentsia, preserving his Polishness within the framework of family life, his career within the depth of Russia should not be read as betrayal.

The third block of articles contains texts devoted to the influence of empires on the shaping of the intelligentsia. Yuliya Sineokaya [‘Intellectual elite in the search of Russian identity’] concentrates on the character of Russian domination. She presents the discrepancy between the authorities and society resulting in crisis in the identity of the Russian intelligentsia (a part of the intellectual elite identified themselves with the people, a part with the authorities). According to the author the greatest controversies revolved around the question of whether a policy of isolation was more beneficial for Russia as opposed to cooperation with the West.

Andrzej Nowak’s article [‘Salvage Russia, save the world (The messianism of the post-Soviet intelligentsia and its historical narrative)’] is devoted to the specifics of the Russian intelligentsia. On the one hand the author discusses the phenomenon of the exceptional nature of this social stratum against a European background in the past (as fundamental determinants of this phenomenon he names belief in their own exceptionality as well as their sense of their own mission and that of the Russian Empire), on the other hand he draws attention to the role of the intelligentsia in post-Soviet reality – the strengthening of the conviction as to the messianism of the Russian nation, which is to protect the Slavs ‘from the role of the *blacks of Europe*, from their domination by the “Atlantic-Protestant” element’.

The three subsequent texts discuss colonial experiences – this being its own kind of confrontation with the experience of the Russian dependent peripheries. Ewa Łukaszyk [‘The “white” and “black” African intelligentsia – silence and loquacity’] presents the birth of the intelligentsia in Portuguese colonies and the role of the state in this process. Blacks who gained assistance on the part of the metropolis in the obtaining of education (and with it

a chance for a better life) identified with its programme – did not formulate their own discourse, one independent of Portuguese inspiration. As a result of the fact that the ‘black’ intelligentsia did not speak with *its own* voice, one may call it ‘mute’, although at times it appears that it is rather too talkative (its programme being its own copy of European models). Anyhow this is an intelligentsia that is ‘unlistened to’ in their countries of origin – African societies accusing them of betrayal. The article’s author expresses, however, the hope that this is only a transitory stage in the history of the African intelligentsia and that with time this group will become fully autonomous.

Krzysztof Iwanek [‘The influence of British rule on the formation of India’s modern intelligentsia’ (the term ‘modern’ relating here to the time when the new intelligentsia took shape and not the ideas professed by them)] examines the problem of the role of Indians educated at British universities in the formation of Indian national consciousness. Here appears the question of civilization oppression. According to the author this was an attempt by the British to create a new social group – Indians with a British value system, world outlook, British tastes, *etc.*

The article by Duc Ha Nguyen [‘“Intelligentsia” in Indochina: collaboration or struggle against colonial rule?'] presents the internal splits within the Vietnamese intelligentsia during the period of French domination – from supporting cooperation with the metropolis, through an attempt at reconciling traditional culture with French models, right up until the revolutionary tendencies. Despite the often brutal economic exploitation of its colony, France attempted to spread civilization progress – the majority of the subsequent military and political leaders who led to the overthrow of French rule, received a careful European level education.

The book ends with a new attempt at a new interpretation of colonialism by Jan Kieniewicz [‘Political violence or civilization oppression? Another attempt at an interpretation of colonialism’]. The author draws attention to the aspiring on the part of imperialist states to impose their own communication code upon subjugated societies. He explains, upon the example of Poland after 1945, that the violence of the title is a means leading to the establishment of domination within the real expanse. The problem is the change in identity experienced by subjugated society (the imaginary expanse). It is for this that an intelligentsia is required. The authorities guarantee them a position in the state, a career, under the condition, however, that they will participate in the deceit that will allow the state to take control of the system of values – it is this very phenomenon that the author calls the ‘silence of the intelligentsia’ (it has lost its ability to communicate with society – communication does not come or equally it occurs in a way that is disturbed or falsified). The said control over the imaginary expanse is civilization oppression. Here also is introduced the concept of a ‘situation’, i.e. an intellectual construction which frees the intelligentsia from a sense

of guilt, from responsibility. The author comes to the conclusion that in all cases of subjugation and submission an analogy with colonialism may be perceived.

The texts appear in the volume in three languages – Polish, Russian and English – which additionally emphasizes the international nature of the research. The book also contains summaries in English of the articles by Krisan', Stępniewska-Holzer, Kieniewicz ('Career or betrayal?'), Nowak and Łukaszczyk, as well as a short note about all the authors.

To sum up, the book brings one closer to the matter of the 'silence' of the intelligentsia understood as a consequence of civilization oppression, presenting the varied experiences connected with the formation of the social stratum in question – the result of a different experiencing of the fact of subjugation to an empire and with it enters itself into the still current considerations of the fate of circles desiring to bring about national programmes and modernizing progress.

trans. Guy Torr

Magdalena Wyrczyńska

Günter Wollstein, *Ein Deutsches Jahrhundert 1848–1945. Hoffnung und Hybris. Aufsätze und Vorträge*, Stuttgart, 2010, Franz Steiner Verlag, 437 pp., series: Historische Mitteilungen – Beihefte, 78

The book by Günter Wollstein, a professor from the University of Cologne, is a collection of articles and conference papers on the history of Germany from the mid nineteenth to the mid twentieth century. We are unlikely to find novelties or one off pieces among the topics dealt with by the author, for his aim appears to be a presentation of, first and foremost, an individualized approach to problem areas which have been discussed at length within German and world historiography, a treatment that constitutes the pinnacle of his many years of work as a researcher. The Polish reader will certainly be interested by the fact that amongst these 'staple' problem areas are to be found two essays on Polish-German relations, while the question of Poland is one that often intertwines itself amongst Wollstein's remaining texts. We are presented with a work from the repertoire of national historiography traditionally orientated towards political-legal questions, one most sound and balanced in its reasoning, and yet one encumbered with the clearly individual stamp of the author's research likings and outlook. For national history is in no way a cold and closed matter, in as often as he involves himself in a subject somewhat 'forgotten' he notes the occurrence with evident regret. Most clearly his texts are to 'remind' readers (and in the original equally those listening, for many of them were texts resulting from public performances)

about those problem areas which, in his opinion, are worth remembering about and which should be remembered. Hence also the sketches included in *The German Century* may be divided formally into two groups: those treating history 'as such' as well as on the history of historical discourse and so-called historical memory.

Before we briefly look at the individual sketches it is worth stopping for a moment at this said individual stamp, one fairly clearly visible in all the texts of the book, which surely must strike the eye of a foreign reader, for here the matter concerns Wollstein's relations to his own national history – to the *hic et nunc* of national historiography. Let us begin with the book's title. A rudimentary knowledge of German history of the last two centuries allows one to guess as to the significance of the German *Hybris*: this is the dream for control over the world, haughtiness and confidence, the more or less racist backed up conviction of superiority over other nations and a particular historical mission. However, what is *Hoffnung* in Wollstein's understanding? Here the matter does not concern a reconstruction of the hopes accompanying 'dreams of might' enlivening the Germans' imagination in an epoch when their country moved from the European economic and political second division to a position of continental hegemonist, one desiring to become a superpower. Wollstein's considerations, developing from an interest in a concrete situation, an event, a moment or historical figure and meticulously protected by elaborated facts, do not head towards the cross-sectional concise syntheses *à la* Mosse, Iggers or Lukacs. Their starting point is rather the multi-volume histories of Germany, rich in both theoretical considerations and historical detail – of, for example, Thomas Nipperdey or Heinrich August Winkler – in which these events have not been reduced to a single common denominator but break up into a series of equally valid currents and tendencies.

Therefore it appears that the *Hoffnung* is for the author a hope for the elicitation and preservation from oblivion of those developmental tendencies in the political history of his country which subsequently the Wilhelmian and Nazi Reich condemned to marginalization, yet which appeared to promise a 'normal' political development: gradual democratization, a non-aggressive relationship to one's neighbours, an egoistic though not 'belligerent' foreign policy. He places this hope, embedded with a counterfactual yearning for the taming of the German *Hybris* and a history which could have averted the 'German catastrophe', in a series of more or less obvious protagonists of his texts. The author's sympathy for the democratic, liberal middle class which led to the revolution of 1848 under the standards of national union, for the army conspirators who prepared an attempt on Hitler's life, as well as for the German Churches, around which the political life of the country concentrated itself particularly in moments of calamity and humiliation, appears obvious. Less evident is the trust, admittedly one stipulated by many

reservations, given in the name of historical justice to such politicians as Bismarck or the 'war chancellor' Bethmann-Hollweg, Prussian civil servants or the theoreticians of German 'Mitteleuropa'. Wollstein appears here a historian carefully weighing all the *pros* and *cons*, which could be considered laudable courage in opposing easy and simplified judgements, if it were not for the fact that those judgements which he himself proposes are usually simply ambiguous.

The first eight sketches contained in *The German Century* (pp. 14–163) are devoted to questions connected with the visions of a unified Germany, its political system and place in Europe in the epoch prior to the revolution of 1848 as well as the reactions to this revolution. This is a traditional area of research interest for the author, dating back to at least the period of his habilitation thesis *Das "Grossdeutschland" der Paulskirche. Nationale Ziele in der bürgerlichen Revolution 1848/49* (1977). He opens the matter with a text devoted to German reactions to the French Revolution, after which appear essays discussing the attitudes of particular political groupings as well as Wilhelm IV in the key years of 1848–50, the attitude of GDR historiography to the traditions of 1848 and the evolution of constitutional solutions within the various German states from 1848 right up until the constitution of the Reich unified by Bismarck in 1870–1. In its entirety there appear two favourite, so it seems, research methods of the author. Firstly, Wollstein willingly and capably analyzes the views of a concrete political group in connection with its aspirations and social position as well as with a concrete historical moment. At the same time he directs his attention somewhere midway between the fairly abstractly comprehended history of political ideas and the history of their practical applications, meanders and consequences. Secondly, he keenly analyzes the evolution of particular problem areas – for example, constitutional or international – through a comparison of the existing relations at several historical turning points (e.g. 1848 – 1871 – 1919). He consequently utilizes the 'photographic' method, precisely noting down the occurring changes yet, unfortunately only hazily sketching in the processes which led to these changes.

Subsequent sketches have been devoted to two controversial chancellors of the unified Reich: Otto von Bismarck and Theobald von Bethmann Hollweg (pp. 164–79 and 222–33). In the case of the founding father of a unified Germany, Wollstein's text – entitled 'Bismarck heute' – naturally does not bring with it anything completely new to the ocean of existing works about him. Here the matter is rather about an evaluation of the views and interpretations within existing literature. Its starting point is the establishment of the fact that the figure of the 'Iron Chancellor' does not arouse controversy today except within the world of professional researchers, which the author states with clearly mixed feelings. Wollstein here puts stress first and foremost on Bismarck's social origin and his formative years, emphasizing

his anachronistic character and a certain losing of himself in the final years of governing. At the same time, however, his evaluation of these years – devoted to a constant battle with any, equally imagined, opposition – is surprisingly light in its appraisal. One may even see in this a certain discrepancy, for it is to Bismarck that Germany owes the burying of the tradition of 1848, which Wollstein so values and desires to ‘rescue from oblivion’.

This same tone may be noted in the author’s considerations on Bethmann Hollweg, to whom he devoted after all a small monograph (1995). Generally burdened with responsibility for provoking the ‘controlled conflict’ which turned out to be the Great War (called by Wollstein the *Urkatastrophe* of the twentieth century), the unfortunate chancellor seems to rather arouse his sympathy. The researcher’s attention is directed at emphasizing the conflicts between the chancellor and the conservative-military lobby and his reformist projects before the outbreak of war as well as the attempts to conclude ‘a peace without annexation’ during its course. In other words, Bethmann Hollweg is shown here as an almost tragic figure – as an adherent of sensible and modernizing policy, who was to suffer defeat in conflict with his own emperor and his military confidants, and also – something Wollstein does not add however – with the demons which he himself awoke.

We find amongst the essays devoted to the two chancellors (pp. 180–221) a text entitled ‘Brüderlichkeit und Todfeindschaft zwischen Deutschen und Polen im langen 19. Jahrhundert’. It starts by recalling a series of analogies in the situation of Germans and Poles following the Congress of Vienna as well as the spontaneous expressions of sympathy for Poland and the Poles following the November Uprising (1830–1). The author points, most convincingly, to his favourite year 1848 as a turning point in which the idea of Romantic-revolutionary brotherhood between neighbouring nations was destroyed, being replaced – at least in Germany – by the discrepancy of interests of the ‘state of national possession’, embedded with a generous dose of chauvinism. The author concentrates his attentions on problems presumably little known to a wider public, although researched fairly long ago in the specialist literature on the subject, yet also failing to disregard a purely German point of view. The deficiency resulting from this is accentuated also by the fact that – if one leaves aside a few poetic quotes – the text in its entirety concerns the political ideas and functioning of the Polish minority within the political life of the Reich. The question of acculturation processes, widely understood forms of cultural interaction as well as the Germanization of Poles in Germany and Polonization of Germans in Poland and therefore everything which nineteenth-century peoples did not consider ‘political’, has escaped his attention.

Matters Polish also run through two other texts contained in the book: concerning the ‘problem of *Mitteleuropa*’ during the interwar years as well as the policy of Nazi Germany towards the Polish Republic before the outbreak

of war (pp. 250–75 and 352–69). These are, once again, studies rich and substantial in their facts devoted to the evolution of political concepts within changing circumstances. In the first of them the author shows the evolution of German conceptions of *Mitteleuropa* and concludes that during the Nazi period they underwent a specific aberration. His text does though prove a certain continuity on the ideological plane even if the methods through which the ideas were realized during the First and Second World Wars were fundamentally different. As far as the second study is concerned a reader involved in Polish affairs will surely be interested in the information about the clashes within the heart of the Nazi leadership over policy concepts for Poland, as well as the key significance for Hitler's foreign policy that was played during the initial phase of his government by the declaration of non-aggression concluded with Poland in 1934. This text corresponds with the sketch on the behind-the-scenes activities for the takeover by the Nazi leadership of German foreign policy (pp. 340–51) in which there is also mention of the German-Polish agreement of 1934.

We can find between these two texts an essay devoted to the effects of the First World War (pp. 234–49). This dimensionally small text appears the most ambitious in the whole book: the author embraces within it the political and psychological consequences of the war, both in the west and east of Europe as well as in America. In a synthetic, accessible and convincing way the author's views on the problem are herein contained, a war that he himself considers to be the key and at the same time fatal moment in the history of Germany as a whole as well as in the history of the twentieth century.

Following on are two portraits of figures from German public life (pp. 292–339 and 370–84), who attempted to oppose the madness of the politics of the National Socialists: a diplomat Rudolf Nadolny as well as General Friderich Olbricht, one of the conspirators in the assassination attempt on Hitler in July 1944. As is easy to imagine the author here presents his heroes first and foremost as tragic figures, for while embroiled in Nazi policy they were nevertheless able to find the strength to finally oppose the Nazis.

The book is concluded with texts on the subject of the Lutheran community in Cologne, that with difficulty was reconstructed after the end of the Second World War, as well as a sectional look at the key moments in the history of the Reich from 1848 right up until Hitler's coming to power (pp. 386–421). In the second of these Wollstein returns to his method of synthetically showing the evolution of political-legal relations through capturing moments in which the existing *status quo* was subjected to the strongest and at the same time the most spectacular pressure. The key question raised here is naturally the problem of the breakdown of the German *Rechtsstaat* in the face of the Nazi rise to power and the reasons for the state's weakness.

The German Century is therefore a book presenting first and foremost the history of political-legal matters to a lesser or greater extent oscillating around the question as to the reasons for the tragic deformation of German public life which allowed the National Socialists to gain power. Its undoubted quality is, as has been already mentioned, that it avoids clear-cut and simple answers so easy to do within the mass of works that have arisen around the German *Sonderweg*. At the same time the author, a specialist in the history of the democratic-liberal movement that led to the revolution of 1848, pays particular attention, not devoid of empathy, to a series of figures – Bismarck, Bethmann Hollweg, Nadolny – who would not be difficult to classify as joint creators of German *Hybris*. Wollstein's factually abundant sketches show rather the continuity of German history, within which the title *Hoffnung* and *Hybris* coexist surprisingly harmoniously, at least until the fatal beginnings of the 1930s. This is presumably the by-product of a natural contradiction resulting from the ambition for a synthetic presentation of a century of German history through rank micro-analyses that overlap on and supplement each other only in actual fact in the first part of the book, that devoted to matters connected with the revolution of 1848.

trans. Guy Torr

Adam Koźuchowski

Jerzy Kłoczowski and Hubert Łaszkiwicz (eds.), *East-Central Europe in European History. Themes & Debates*, Lublin, 2009, Institute of East Central Europe, 500 pp.

This extensive volume is the aftermath of the prestigious conference that took place in November 2008 in Warsaw. The organizers – in first place the Lublin Institute of East Central Europe – managed to assemble not only eminent historians from Poland and eastern Europe (to mention Jerzy W. Borejsza, Gábor Klaniczay, Henryk Samsonowicz, Andrzej Chwalba, Mykola Riabchuk and Andriy Portnov), but also renowned researchers from other countries (amongst whom figures of the ranking of Jean Delumeau and André Vauchez). The volume contains in addition political commentary and reflections from, among others, Zbigniew Brzeziński, Władysław Bartoszewski and Adam Daniel Rotfeld. Patronage over the sections was taken by the Polish ministers of foreign affairs and culture, as equally the mayor of Warsaw. The publication itself does not cover all the contributions of all the conference participants, though there are included several new texts and a relatively numerous reissue of papers and articles published earlier. The Polish texts have been translated into English while the French remain in the original.

The papers organized into five chapters concern, in the broadest understanding, definitions and the specifics of East-Central Europe, one of the most important motifs being that of borders. Starting with the introduction by Jerzy Kłoczowski, amongst the authors there dominates the conviction that – in accordance with the theses of Oskar Halecki – the historical territories of the Czech lands, Hungary and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth belong to this region. Some, like Georges-Henri Soutou and Piotr Górecki, draw attention to the evolution of this concept, its historical and geopolitical validity was, however, never questioned. Amongst the arguments that appear in the various contributions in favour of such a geographical shape for the region we may find, among others, considerations into the character of the local civilization, one opposed first and foremost to Russian civilization. There even appears (in the paper by Mykhailo Kirsenko) a thesis of the nineteenth-century origin of the cultural gulf between the Ukraine and Russia, brought about, as the author claims, by the different structure of agricultural ownership. A consequence of such a geographical-civilizational definition of the region adopted by the authors and editors is the disproportional presence of Ukraine throughout the work. This is documented not only by practically every political science contribution within the volume, but also by four comprehensive articles by Ukrainian researchers (Portnov, Riabchuk, Kirsenko, Ihor Skoczylas). Other parts of East-Central Europe – with the exception of Poland – emerge against such a background extremely modestly in scope: to the history of the Czech lands, Hungary, the Habsburg monarchy in actual fact only single articles have been devoted, the Baltic States – despite the presence at the conference of several Lithuanian historians – are excluded from consideration within the volume. In this sense the work under review is a faithful record of the geopolitical interests of Polish public opinion at the beginning of the twenty first century.

Subsequent parts of the volume are arranged chronologically. Particularly interesting is the medievalist chapter with excellent contributions by Henryk Samsonowicz, Gábor Klaniczay, Petr Hlaváček and Piotr Górecki. This is at the same time the part that is the most ‘open’ in relation to methodological considerations: the authors employ the instrumentation of *histoire croisée*, as well as making recourse to the recently fashionable concept of collective memory. Similar sources of inspiration make themselves felt in the subsequent part concerned with the heritage of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Habsburg monarchy (first and foremost in the considerations of Michel Masłowski). The next section, dealing with the influence of totalitarian regimes in our region though admittedly containing the significant considerations of Jerzy W. Borejsza and Tomasz Schramm on the nature of totalitarian and authoritarian regimes and the ‘susceptibility’ of particular countries to fascism, in the remaining papers describes in a Manichaeic manner from the beginning of the 1990s, ‘foreign’ totalitarianisms, opposing them with the resistance

displayed towards them by the societies of East-Central Europe. The subject of the final chapter is the policy of the West in relation to our region from the nineteenth century to the present day, with particular consideration being devoted to the question of the forming of a modern civil consciousness in the Ukraine (in the paper by Riabchuk).

The materials assembled in the volume may be equally read in a completely different order, for we are dealing with exceedingly varied comments and statements. A separate, though one scattered over various chapters, group is that of analyses of historical discourse. Of note within this group of texts is the astute article by Andriy Portnov, describing the application of 'western' research trends and concepts within contemporary Ukrainian historiography. The author through this arrives at conclusions whose utility exceeds the specificity of the Ukraine. He draws attention to the role of translations which only in a fragmentary way convey the form of foreign discussion, applying it to local ideological needs. Hence the durability of the 'totalitarian paradigm', as well as the one-sidedness of the western Sovietology translated into Ukrainian. The German tradition of *Ostforschung* is the subject of a detailed analysis by Eduard Mühle, who emphasizes at the same time the benefits to be derived from historical comparative studies. The article by Hubert Łaszkiwicz should be included in a group of similar texts on the historiographical debates into the nature of Polish gentry democracy.

A decidedly separate group of texts are those with a political hue, concentrating chiefly on Ukraine. At times the reader is under the impression that the above mentioned analyses of historical discourse could quite successfully have incorporated into their source base certain conference papers like, for example, the highly emotional piece by Mykhailo Kirsenko.

Consequently the material assembled in the book in question rarely surprises one with new ideas, nor opens up hitherto unknown research fields. The postulates advanced by Andrzej Chwalba, in sketching out future directions for research into the region, have here not been realized. To formulate charges and to list the sources of inspiration that are absent would, however, be missing the point. For *East-Central Europe in European History. Themes & Debates* is not an attempt to open up new horizons but rather a summing up of, first and foremost, Polish research into the history of East-Central Europe. In places this attempt is transformed into a – deserved – homage to the greatest researchers of the region. The book documents first of all the general European significance of the works by Jerzy Kłoczowski and Karol Modzelewski (including the universal reference on the part of the participants to the concepts of a 'younger' and 'barbarian' Europe). This is equally the objection – and significantly one raised by researchers from outside of the region (e.g. Chantal Delsol) – to an ignoring of European peripheries. From this perspective the volume has a documentary and prestigious significance, showing where research into central and eastern Europe is, and

not undertaking attempts to point to its future routes for development. Even if the material leaves one with a certain sense of wanting more, it is worth realizing that this area of historiography has a rich tradition and possesses individuals who enjoy an international reputation.

In a sense the symbolic character of the book finds its reflection in the extremely pleasing and clear graphic layout. A separate problem is that of the quality of the translations and editing, which is incompatible with a work of such importance. The English of the translated texts leaves a lot to be desired with regard to stylistics. There are equally a lot of mistakes in the spelling of place and surnames names (including that of one of the editors). The copy editors have failed to standardize the pattern to be followed for footnotes, as well as the spelling of place names (particularly the transcription of the said from Russian and Ukrainian) as equally research terms (just to mention a single example – the Polish *miejsca pamięci* – *lieux de mémoire* – appears both as ‘places of memory’ [p. 455], and... ‘mausoleums’ [p. 273], while the English title of Pierre Nora’s book, from where the concept is taken, translates it as *realms of memory*). For readers from East-Central Europe an unpleasant surprise will be the unusually free approach on the part of the editors toward the diacritic marks used in the region, as also the mess in geographic terminology (for example, in relation to the Ukrainian lands the terms Rus’, Ruthenia, as equally Russia are used alike). It also strikes one that the circle of readers would be greater if the French texts had also been translated into English. The knowledge of French needed to read the volume is no longer widespread.

trans. Guy Torr

Maciej Górny