

REVIEWS

Acta Poloniae Historica
103, 2011
PL ISSN 0001-6892

Wojciech Fałkowski, Bernd Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter (eds.), *Ritualisierung politischer Willensbildung. Polen und Deutschland im hohen und späten Mittelalter*, Wiesbaden, 2010, Harrassowitz Verlag, 275 pp., series: Quellen und Studien – Deutsches Historisches Institut Warschau, 24

The book under review is the result of a conference organised at Speyer (15–17 May 2008), which was the second meeting in a cycle devised as a permanent forum for the exchange of information and ideas amongst German and Polish medievalists.¹ The subject of the conference was the broadly understood ritualising political acts (and more precisely – the undertaking of political decisions) within the central and late Middle Ages in both Poland and Germany.

Not all the texts within the book fit neatly into this formula. Besides, they do not create within themselves a coherent whole. There is also nothing visible in the texts that constitutes a genuine dialogue between the academics from both countries: their works do not correspond with each other, and what links them is but a loosely comprehended general idea, one imposed by the organisers of the meeting and the editors of the volume in question. All of which is an inevitable sign that the formula for meetings of this type is a good one but that cooperation ought to be developed with the aim of evoking an effective discussion, a deepening of academic bonds as well as the provoking of understanding between researchers into the same epoch.

That the question lies in understanding is clearly borne out by the two introductions to the book, written by a Pole and a German – Wojciech Fałkowski and Klaus Ziemer. Fałkowski ('Rituale und politische Entscheidungsfindung. Einleitende Bemerkungen') devotes a sizeable amount of room to two completely non-medieval artefacts and reflections upon them. He recalls the meeting of Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki and Chancellor Helmut Kohl in 1989, and the embrace of peace and friendship that the two politicians exchanged. He analyses this fact – most interestingly – by applying

¹ The first took place in Wrocław 3–5 June 2005 and was entitled 'The Middle Ages – one or many? Neighbours in the history of the Middle Ages' resulting in the publication of: Sławomir Moździoch, Wojciech Mrozowicz and Stanisław Rosik (eds.), *Mittelalter – eines oder viele? Średniowiecze – jedno czy wiele?* (Colloquia, 7, Wrocław, 2010).

a model of medieval ritual. Next Fałkowski recalls the representation of the Polish Senate from the so-called Statute of Laski of 1505 depicted on the Speyer conference poster. The image emphasised the meaning of balance between the ruler and society's political representation. However, the author attempted a deeper interpretation, underlining the analogy between the sixteenth-century Jagiellonian state (where a vast array of peoples lived in peace) and our contemporary uniting Europe. This comparison is undoubtedly apt, however – I do not know whether this had been the author's intention – somewhat worrying in its scope, not only given the memory of the demise of the old Commonwealth but also with regard to the knowledge of the crisis of democracy experienced by the state merely a few decades after the Union of Lublin. The matter has a connection with the second of the introductory texts and if only for this it follows to mention the said. For the illustration mentioned by Fałkowski was meant to represent the entire Jagiellonian state, while in fact it merely depicted the Senate of the Kingdom of Poland. Representation of Lithuania, which dwarfed the Poland of the time in terms of territory and population, is totally absent. This absence is significant: in the eastern part of the Jagiellonian state, in opposition to that of the western part, 'noble democracy' did not, in effect, function, decisions were taken by the Rutheno-Lithuanian magnates. And it was they who, from the end of the sixteenth century, started to dominate within the entire state, bringing with time the famed 'golden freedom' to platitude, something not perceived to this day by a startling number of historians.

This is well conveyed by Klaus Ziemer's text ('Polens Selbstverständnis aus seiner Geschichte'), which, in its content, does not fit with the rest of the articles, though the justification for publication is its attempt to bring closer to German readers the history of a country that a significant part of this publication is concerned with. This sketch – as the author's introductory declarations announce – was to show the most important points of the national mythology of contemporary Poles and to extract their characteristics. And this it does. However, a certain methodological dichotomy, namely the desire to show equally an outline of the 'real' history of the country means that certain inconsistencies appear in the text in question.

In the initial survey of Poland's history, Ziemer notes the many changes to its territorial shape. In his opinion this is connected with the existence of two conceptions of the location and existence of this state: i.e. the 'Piast concept' linking itself with anti-Germanism and the 'Jagiellonian concept' – directed against Russia. Consequently the author pushes to the side the fact that the 'Piast concept' started its existence only in the twentieth century and served as the historical justification for the obtaining by Poland of the so-called Recovered Territories after World War Two. However, this sort of idea was one required by the author in order to uncover contemporary traces of fear of the Germans and to combine these with the alleged 'Piast option', as well

as to contrast it with the vision of a Jagiellonian leadership of Poland with the aim of the westernising of the countries of the so-called Intermarium (between the Baltic and the Black Sea). However, we do not know whether Ziemer believes in this sort of idea, or whether he simply is relating concepts fostered amongst certain political options.

The article is extensive but is also unable, however, to encompass the mass of important problems, and although the author neatly inserts them into the baggage of his text, they slip out beyond its edges. This is unavoidable: the combining within a single sketch of Sarmatism with the concept of being the antemurale of Europe, the idea of the struggle 'for our freedom and yours' with the question of Poles attitudes to national minorities, the consideration of the problem of the significance of the Catholic and other Churches was indeed a breakneck scheme. All the more so that at a certain moment the author forgets that he is writing about ideas and starts to praise the real – in his opinion – permanent aspirations of Poles for freedom as well as their mission in the Europeanising of East-Central Europeans. Admittedly this type of slogan flatters my patriotic feelings, but reason, however, prompts me into realising that something is here wrong. If we are going to talk about freedom then we should at least remember, even forgetting about illusory 'noble freedom' from the seventeenth century, that a sizeable number of Poles gained personal freedom only with the tsar's edict (*ukase*) in 1864, while traces of a feudal mentality are easy to find within our society even to this day. To be fair to the author, however, one should add that he has based himself on Polish literature, which often without reflection echoes the slogans of nineteenth-century noble historiography, which, unfortunately, does not allow one to understand the condition of contemporary Poles.

However, that is enough on the introductory texts for although they raise important matters, the fundamental message of the book under review differs from them, in accordance – more or less – with the title of the volume. The articles are arranged in five parts, according to the ranking and character of the authority creating the political decisions. We have, therefore, sketches on the regal sphere, next ducal, later there is talk of universities, cities and finally the Church and religious orders. The said scheme is a sound one, even the inclusion of texts on the Polish monarchs in the 'ducal' part – although debateable – does have its own form of explanation if only in viewing their significance as lesser when compared to the monarchs of Germany or France.

The substance of the book opens with Gerd Althoff ('Kommunikation des Königs mit den Fürsten'), whose object of interest is the personal meetings of the monarch with the aristocratic elite, the talks conducted to ensure the attainment of concord in situations of conflict. Althoff – in noting the spontaneity of the said situations – underlines the significance of ritual within the whole process. Ritual manifested and sealed change, bestowed on it social sanction. The author distinguishes three main types of communication on

the part of the king with dukes and princes: 1. informal (talks, negotiations); 2. formalised, ritualised activities connected with the undertaking of political decisions; 3. the final ritual, through the aid of which the agreement obtained was brought into life. To illustrate his theses Althoff refers to examples taken chiefly from the Ottonian epoch.

The second and final text from those of the 'regal' part has been written by Martin Kintzinger ('*Coronam sustentare*. Krönung und Konsens in Frankreich und im deutschen Reich im Spätmittelalter'). He approaches affairs from a general definition of the concept of 'undertaking decisions' (*Willensbildung*) and signals the existence in the Middle Ages of a 'mixed political system', and namely the combining of regal authority (status) and the will of powerful elites (delegation). The interaction of both of these spheres was well seen during the course of the coronation ceremony, in the duration of which the acceptance of the political elites and their support for the act being performed was particularly strongly manifested with the help of special staging. The basis for this analysis was the comparison of two texts – documents laying down the law, supplied in addition with significant illustrations. The matter concerns the Golden Bull of Charles IV of 1356, regulating the political system of the Reich and *Livre du sacre* of 1365, which had as its purpose the strengthening of Charles V's right to the throne of France. The illustrations for the Golden Bull were commissioned by Wenceslaus IV after he was dethroned in Germany in 1400. The pictures created referred to the agreement for the subordination of the duke-electors to the king. In essence the manifestation of the consensus would have been understood as a taunt at the electors who had after all chosen Wenceslaus as king of Germany, and yet later had dethroned him. The illustrations for *Livre du sacre* were created in 1372 on the order of Charles V, who despite taking power almost twenty years earlier (the text itself came into being a year after his coronation) remained in constant uncertainty as to his grip on the throne, threatened as his was by pretenders. In the text itself and the illustrations depicting certain stages of the coronation, there appears a strong manifestation of the sacrality of the king's position as well as the accord of the ducal elite essential to exercise authority. Despite the lack of a direct link between both documents, they are joined by the fact that they were produced at a similar time, by an attempt to form, in part to create, certain solutions to the state's political system (even if there were to be postulates) as well as by the manifestation of a consensus process, expressed by ritual, of undertaking political decisions by the monarch and an exclusive group of dukes. There is an absence in the essay of background referring to art history, which existed, justifying one and not another form of depicting the state presented in pictures of coronation. This motif would, however, noticeably increase the size of the text.

Antoni Barciak ('Tage und Debatten im Beisein des Herzogs in Polen. Zur Funktionsweise von Tagen [*wiece*] des 13. Jahrhunderts') commences

the part devoted to ducal power. In his introduction he presents the state of research into places of power in Poland, attempting to distinguish places of permanent meetings of dukes with their subjects as well as with other Piast authorities. He attempts to recreate, in basing himself in particular on Czech examples, by means of comparative studies, the spatial structure of locations of assemblies, situated usually at ducal residences. Next, based on extensive research into Polish studies on the matter – limiting himself merely to historiography without attempt at recourse to academic inquiries, e.g., anthropological ones – Barciak presents a model for the course of debate occurring with the participation of the dukes and discovers, in principle, an obvious model for it. In somewhat simplifying the question, this involved the presentation of the matter to the assembled, the establishment of views by the duke and the authority elite, and subsequently the presentation of the resolution to the people gathered at the assembly.

Zbigniew Dalewski ('Ritual im Wandel. Herzogserhebungen der polnischen Herrscher um die Wende vom 12. zum 13. Jahrhundert') deliberates over the changes that occurred in the principdom of Cracow as a result of the ending of the principate system established by Boleslav the Wry-mouthed and the coming into existence of the practice of selection, on the part of the nobility of Lesser Poland, of a prince from amongst the Piasts who most met their expectations. The basis for the author's considerations is a detailed analysis of fragments of Kadlubek's *Chronicle* which refers to the expulsion from Cracow of Mieszko III the Old (1177) as well as the death of Casimir II the Just (1194) and the struggle for the Cracow throne which raged toward the end of the twelfth century. The main problem undertaken by the author was the tracing of the changes that occurred in the Polish coronation *ordo* (in which the author notes an interesting motif of *benedictio principis* – according to him referring to the rite of royal appointment). Dalewski stresses that, in connection with social transformations and the growing role of the magnates, their acceptance turned out to be necessary from the end of the twelfth century for the taking of power in Cracow, and he attempts to discover elements within the ritual of establishing a prince (at that time still possessing the remains of quasi royal authority) emphasising the consensual character of granting power.

Tomasz Jurek ('Ritual und Technik der sozialen Kommunikation zwischen Landesherrn und Gesellschaft in Polen im 13. Jahrhundert') had a difficult task before him. The subject of his work may be most broadly understood – for the sphere of information exchange covers many: words, writing, gesture, performances of the manifestation of authority, etc. Each of these phenomena is a problem in itself. Aware of the difficulties, Jurek concentrated rather on communication in the traditional meaning of the term, and thus as information exchange. The parties in this said exchange are for him the sovereign and the subjects (he notes transfer in both directions) first of the principalities,

while later of the united Polish Kingdom, for the paper, regardless of the title, extends beyond the thirteenth century and goes up until the end of the Middle Ages. The author is involved in various aspects of the problem: the oral exchange of information – poorly confirmed in the sources, but for all that present in principle right up until the end of the old Commonwealth's existence; he equally examines the functioning of legations, assemblies, and finally the meaning and circulation of a document.

The 'ducal' part of the book is concluded by Gerald Schwedler's essay ('Inszenierung des Reichs: *concordia*, Versammlungen der Fürsten und Kurvereine im späteren Mittelalter bis zur Goldenen Bulle'). The author assumes that the performance depicting the character of the Reich involved first and foremost presentations of its rulers, for initially the principle of unity in the figure of the monarch and the state was in force. However, with time, the idea of the state lost its direct connection with the person of a monarch. This task was taken over by the electoral college, meeting at conventions with, or without, the participation of the monarch. The author wanted to show the visual side of the process of the transfer from *Hoftag* (the royal convention called under the aegis of the monarch) to the *Reichstag* (a state convention, at which the monarch appeared only as one of many participants in the meeting). For Schwedler the starting point for further analysis of the problem was the tombstone of the archbishop of Mainz, Peter von Aspelt (1308–20), during whose pontificate there occurred the coronations of three monarchs, presented on the stone next to the hierarchy: Henry VII of Luxemburg, Louis IV the Bavarian and John of Luxemburg, king of the Czech lands). The author astutely analyses the iconography of the tomb and in substantiating his arguments by highlighting the political situation in the Reich, he shows the aspirations of the highest placed Church dignitaries to participate in state power, in particular Archbishop Balduin von Trier (an administrator of the archbishopric of Mainz for the years 1328–36). The analysed tombstone was made on his orders.

The first of the two texts on the university world is an article by Robert Gramsch ('Vor und hinter den Kulissen: Mechanismen und Rituale der Macht an der spätmittelalterlichen Universität'). The author attempts to sketch the complicated structure of dependence (both internally and externally corporative) within which the elites managing universities at the end of the Middle Ages were embroiled. Gramsch describes a conflict which occurred in Padua in the mid-fifteenth century – during the course of university celebrations there broke out a brawl between two factions. A dispute over status became an opportunity for a public manifestation of long-standing disagreements. Admittedly within this concrete instance the sides in conflict constituted so-called nations: on the one hand German, and the other Italian, but this type of incident – as the author proves – occurred all over Europe at this time. An important stimulus for these fracas were the customs brought into the

university from outside, from knightly culture, within which rivalry was an important element. In theory university rituals aimed to stabilise and integrate the various milieu, but often they were themselves the scene of confrontation.

Matters of university contact with the state are the area of interest for Krzysztof Ożóg ('Die Krakauer Universität und ihre Teilnahme am öffentlichen Leben des jagiellonischen Königreiches'). Before the author deals with the concrete matter in hand, he has located it within the wider context of the evolution of the position of universities from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries – from *studium generale* independent of the state, considered to even be the third universal power next to *imperium* and *sacerdotium*, to their subordination to the state within an estate monarchy. The universalism of *studium generale* was also undermined by the fact that in the fifteenth century when conciliarism collapsed, there disappeared the need within the Church for independent, supranational debaters with a university education. Having at his disposal this sort of scheme for changes within the character of the institution, Ożóg involves himself in the details of the relations of Cracow University with royal power in Poland. He points out, first and foremost, the contribution of professors to the diplomatic service of the Jagiellonians (contacts with the papacy, participation at councils, in diplomatic and legal disputes with the Teutonic Order) as well as in the arena of internal politics (law, the fight with the Hussites and others). The author underlines that Cracow University preserved a significant degree of autonomy throughout the whole of the medieval period.

Urban problems commence the paper by Henryk Samsonowicz, who, somewhat in defiance of the title ('Wer herrschte über Stadt im Spätmittelalter'), deals with a content matter wider in scope than just the problems of the authority of the urban elites. The author attempts to present this extensive subject as clearly as possible through a contrasting of the principles of communal order with the electoral practice in selecting town authorities. For example in Gdańsk or Lwów the local government elite was selected independently yet only from amongst the patriciate; in the capital, Cracow, theoretically all citizens took part in the process of electing the city authority – although in practice the conditions were dictated by the oligarchy of influential families. Samsonowicz notes that in the towns of a strategic significance for the monarchy, e.g. Warsaw, elections in the early modern period took place with the participation of a representative of the state authorities, the owners of private towns intervened similarly in questions of the election of mayors and councils. In practice, therefore, although large towns, following the purchase by them of the *vogt* office, were theoretically independent, there were always attempts to reach a certain compromise in order to avoid the selection for office of individuals who might draw the town into conflict. The conciliarism of municipal authorities was all the more necessary given that Polish urban societies were multiethnic – hence difficulties appeared in

finding agreements between German law (possessing, after all, several codified versions) and that of others: Ruthenian, Jewish and at times even Wallachian.

Peter Schuster ('Rituale und Willensbildung bei kommunalen Versammlungen') shatters the possible illusions as to the full democratic character of urban authority in Germany (and we are to suppose within the whole of Europe as well) in the central and late Middle Ages. For at this time oligarchic systems formed such a strong dichotomy between this narrow elite and the rest of the townsmen that the former started to consider themselves as sovereigns of the town and entitled themselves 'lords', while those socially lower placed were referred to as the 'community' (*Gemeinde*) and were considered as subjects. This form of property manifested itself also in rituals – for example, immediately after the establishment of a new city council the burghers would pay them homage and swear obedience. Similarly each meeting of the townsmen with their local authority would be accompanied by gestures of obedience and allegiance on the part of the community. The internal composition of the town council was not especially tolerant of opposition, while the opposition would remain, even in the face of serious problems, silent in fear of the anger and reprisals of the ruling group; agreement was in effect forced. The council and their subject citizens regularly met in court; these meetings were also ritualised. What is interesting, upon proving somebody guilty he/she was forced to ritually humble himself/herself before a crucifix and then before the council itself. All rituals used during council sittings and various town events as well as in the courts served to create order, subordination and obedience. Because this system did not allow for expressions of opposition, this usually took on the character of revolt against the council. The monarch tended to support in such situations the city authorities, seeing in them bastions of order.

The last part of the work discusses Church matters. Andrzej Radziwiński in his highly systemised paper ('Königliche Herrschaft und kirchliche Gemeinschaften im spätmittelalterlichen Polen') deals with the following aspects: 1. The role of the sovereign in the creation of cathedral and collegiate communities in late medieval Poland. The author has noted the noticeable significance of the monarchs (particularly the Jagiellonians, who jointly with Vytautas, founded bishoprics in Wilno and for Samogitia, and later the Latin rite bishopric in Lwów), but if the matter concerns collegiate chapter then the participation by monarchs at this time was minimal, much less than the participation of bishops, magnates and even burghers. 2. The involvement of monarchs in the appointment of the benefices of chapters. According to Radziwiński, this was significant in the Poland of the fourteenth to the fifteenth century, about which papal privileges decided, the matter being similar in the question of the prebends of canons – and this in turn constituted significant influence on the part of the monarchs on the social composition of Polish chapters. Within them the gentry dominated, supported by the kings.

This is the 3rd problem analysed by the author. 4. The conflicts between the monarchs and cathedral chapters as a result of appointments in the bishoprics. However, under the rule of Ladislas Jagiello only one candidate was forced through against the king's wishes, although later gaining his acceptance. 5. The character and aim of meetings between the king and cathedral chapters and other groups of clergy. These were connected first and foremost with matters of finance, only of secondary importance were issues of piety. 6. The financial support of the monarchs by the cathedral chapters. This involved customary presents to mark the election of bishops or informal gifts in a situation when, for example, the king set off for war, or had fallen into financial difficulties. Generally speaking Radzimiński shows the serious institutional and financial links of the sovereign with the Church in the fourteenth and fifteenth century.

Jörg Sonntag ('Zwischen Transzendenz und Immanenz. Rituale der Entscheidungsfindung im mittelalterlichen Klöstern und Orden') deals with a matter which recalls in its own way squaring the circle. For in theory a monastery was supposed to be the foreboding of paradise and therefore the rules of all the orders, more or less, banned all forms of individualism, including the expression and exertion of one's arguments and opinions. On the other hand, however, the superior of a monastic community should in all the most general questions seek the advice of the brothers, though he did not have to in any way adhere to this. In practice this was not always the case. Generally speaking, the Benedictines approached the matter in an extremely ritualised way, appealing to transcendence (emphasising the sacrality of the decision), while the Dominicans strove for rationalism and righteousness. The process of establishing a decision was, between the tenth and twelfth century, more or less as follows: if there was the need for consultation on the part of the head of the monastery with the community of monks, a meeting was called during the course of which the prior (abbot) presented the problem and listened to the advice of his subordinates. In theory the head of the monastery embodied Christ, while his monks resembled the apostles, therefore the brothers were obliged to total subservience, yet they were also to incorporate a mutual love and care for each other. The place for meetings – the chapterhouse (rarer the monastery cemetery) – was considered to be the holiest part of the monastery, which also had an influence on the character of the community's proceedings taking place there. In reality the only actual influence that ordinary monks had on what occurred within the collective was at the moment of the election of their leader. However, several examples of the arguments shown by Sonntag illustrate that in practice within orders of this nature the consensus that was forced, equally ritually, often covered up deep felt consternation with the decisions of the monastery authorities.

Thomas Wünsch ('Ritual und Politik. Partikularsynoden als Instrumente der politischen Willensbildung in der polnisch-litauischen Adelsrepublik')

attempts to prove the thesis that the provincial councils and plenary councils of the Polish clergy in the late Middle Ages constituted a counterweight to the well developed representative noble democracy. Meetings of this sort occurred in a ritualised way and partly their aim was (besides the obvious resolving of Church matters) to take a stance on political matters. The synods constituted a functional organ of the clergy, with the task of participation in the government of the country and its provinces to some degree; in cooperation with the emancipating gentry but at times in competition with it. The author finds a temporal parallel between the meetings of various type, in particular the more important gentry ones and the synods of the priesthood (he includes an extensive table showing the parity of both types of assembly). In proving his thesis he reaches back to the times of the early Middle Ages in order to show that then there existed a certain compatibility in the development of Church self-government and the evolution of the state's political system, from the very beginning of the appearance in Poland of an institution of representation.

The book concludes with a piece by Stefan Weinfurter ('Rituale, Willensbildung und Entscheidungsprozesse. Zusammenfassung'), ordering and summing up the reflections assembled within it. He attempts besides to bestow a wider dimension on the deliberations undertaken in the volume.

In summing up, it follows to state that the said book is an interesting and successful work. Thanks to the variety of texts – undertaking intriguing matters analysed in an insightful way – many will find inspiring deliberations within its pages. Even if, as was noted in the introduction to this review, the articles do not correspond with each other, and equally do not create a synthesis of the phenomenon of the ritualised undertaking of political decisions in the Middle Ages, one needs to remember that academia is not always about neat constructions designed to house the embodiment of some phenomenon or other. Equally worthwhile, and sometimes even more so, is the asking of questions, the provoking of discussion. And for certain this book does just that. If only through the fact that it attempts to show the views of different environments, to confront them with each other. For the viewing of distinctiveness, as we so well know, is always rich.

trans. Guy Torr

Andrzej Pleszczyński

Hélène Millet, *Le concile de Pise. Qui travaillait à l'union de l'Église d'Occident en 1409?*, Turnhout, 2010, Brepols, 443 pp., series: *Ecclesia militans. Histoire des hommes et des institutions de l'Église au Moyen Âge*, ed. Hélène Millet and Pascal Montaubin

The Council of Pisa, which deliberated in 1409 on the terms for ending the Great Western Schism, was not to see a modern monograph on the occasion of the 600th anniversary of its convening. There was not to appear in the renowned series 'Konziliengeschichte' the planned book by the German medievalist Dieter Girgensohn, who for several decades has been researching and publishing works on this particular area of interest, a work that was to be devoted to the Council of Pisa. Which is also the reason the French researcher Hélène Millet decided to assemble and print in a single volume six of her studies on the Council of Pisa, which were published from 1981 to 2005. The volume opens with 'Avant-propos' (pp. 7–18) and 'Cadre chronologique' (pp. 19–21). In the introductory remarks the author has noted that the Council of Pisa does not enjoy a good position within Catholic historiography, emphasising that not only did it fail to solve the problems of the Church but it actually deepened the schism. As a result she has undertaken an attempt to go beyond such a standpoint and to view the accomplishments of the Council of Pisa in 1409 through the prism of the sources in which it once appeared as the restorer of Church unity. Millet considers that there is a need to rehabilitate the work of this council. Her collection of studies should contribute to this. This position is expressed to a certain degree by the subtitle to the volume, which at the same time points to the character of the studies it contains, for these concern first and foremost the participants of the Council of Pisa. In her research into the council's participants the French medievalist has employed a prosopographical method in order, through a deeper knowledge of this group of people, to enter into their motivations and reach the centre and core of council events. The chronological table that precedes the studies contains a chronological ranking of events from the convening of the council in Pisa to its conclusion, together with information about the councils at Perpignan and Cividale. In a separate column there are specified the clergy celebrating Holy Mass at the beginning of the particular council sessions.

The first study: 'Un témoin scandinave de la propagande en faveur du concile de Pise (1409)' (pp. 23–36), was written by Hélène Millet in collaboration with Élisabeth Mornet, and was published for the first time in: *Papauté, monachisme et théories politiques: études d'histoire médiévale offerts à Marcel Pacaut*, i: *Le pouvoir et l'institution ecclésiastique* (Lyon, 1994 [pp. 123–34]). The authors carried out an analysis of two manuscripts created within the circles

of the Roman pope Gregory XII and containing documents linked to the proposed meeting of Gregory XII with Benedict XIII for the period 1406–7, the seceding cardinals (1408) and their attempts to summon a council to Pisa as well as the reaction of the Christian world to these events. The first of these manuscripts was held at the Uppsala University Library under the catalogue number C 47, while the second at the Vatican Library under the catalogue number Vat. lat. 3477. The researchers claimed that both manuscripts are related to each other, for as they hold the same documents, though in a somewhat different arrangement, there must therefore be an indirect link between them. They have managed to convincingly show that the created document collections were used by the cardinals in diplomatic activities with the aim of obtaining support for the convened council at Pisa. Most likely the manuscript C 47 made its way to Sweden (it belonged to the monastery library at Vadstena) during the times of the mission of the Premonstratensian Christian Cobant, the canon of Ratzeburg, sent by the cardinals in the September of 1408 to the Scandinavian kingdoms and the Church provinces there in order to persuade them to take part in the council. Christian Cobant's mission brought an effect, for the kingdoms of the Kalmar Union were represented at Pisa by him.

The principal part of the volume (pp. 37–234) is filled with an edition of the list of the participants of the Council of Pisa from the manuscript of the National University Library in Turin No. E II 3 (f. 45–94v). This was published for the first time in 1981 in *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen Âge – Temps Modernes*, 93/2, pp. 713–90. However, Millet supplements the edition in the present volume with extensive comments including identifications of the council participants: 'Édition d'une nouvelle liste. Additions aux notes d'identification des Pères conciliaires' (pp. 235–84). The publication of this valuable source has been preceded with an introduction, in which the French researcher discusses six lists of participants at the Council of Pisa, known in the relevant literature up until 1981. The list found by Millet, from a Turin manuscript from the beginning of the fifteenth century, distinguishes itself in relation to others by its completeness. It contains the names of 450 participants, including a significant group of procurators of various clergymen and Church institutions, arranged hierarchically. The editor has put a great deal of work into the identification of individuals and institutions found in the Turin list, supplemented and confronted with three newly discovered registers of council participants. This edition and notes on the individuals has most seriously broadened knowledge about the circles of Pisa council participants. I would like here to complement these remarks regarding those clergymen from Poland present at the Council of Pisa.

In the extensive note devoted to Piotr Wysz, the bishop of Cracow, who represented the Polish king Ladislas Jagiello, the grand duke of Lithuania Vytautas as well as the archbishop of Gniezno, Mikołaj Kurowski (pp. 58, 249)

Millet does not take into consideration Wysz's cooperation in the drawing up of the Church reform programme which was presented to Pope Alexander V by the Council of Pisa. This was contained in a document entitled: 'De reformatione Ecclesie'. This problem has been discussed more widely, including the publishing of an edition of the said document, by: Władysław Abraham, Johannes Vincke, Władysław Seńko and Thomas Wünsch.¹

In relation to the envoy of the prince of Masovia Siemovit IV, who is referred to in the list as: 'V.V.D. Paulus prepositus ecclesie S. Marie Magdalene extra muros Placenses O. Prem.' (p. 60), the French researcher in following on from Władysław Abraham correctly names him Paul of Swarocin (p. 252). It follows, however, to add that he was a *praepositus* of the Premonstratensian monastery at Płock from 1398 and was appointed the prince's procurator for the council already on 22 December 1408.²

Hélène Millet was unable to find information on Grzegorz, bishop of Lodomeria (Volodymyr), who was mentioned in the list of council participants in the group of bishops ('R.P.D. Gregorius episcopus Landameriensis', p. 70). The figure of the Dominican, prior of the friary in Lutsk, Grzegorz (Gregory) of Buczków, the bishop of Lodomeria for the years 1400–24, closely connected with Witold, the grand duke of Lithuania, has been well investigated in the Polish literature on the subject.³

Within the Dominican group ('Secuntur generales ordinum primo generalis Predicatorum') there figures the order's general Thomas of Fermo 'cum

¹ Władysław Abraham, 'Reforma na soborze w Pizie i udział w niej przedstawicieli Kościoła polskiego', *Polonia Sacra*, 3 (1919), 114–25; Johannes Vincke, 'Zu den Konzilien von Perpignan und Pisa', *Römische Quartalschrift*, 50 (1955), 89–94; Władysław Seńko, *Piotr Wysz z Radolina (ok. 1354–1414) i jego dzieło "Speculum aureum"* (Warsaw, 1996), 251–3; Thomas Wünsch, 'Das Reformprogramm des Krakauer Bischofs Petrus Wysz 1392–1412. Mit Neuedition der 22-Punkte-Liste "De Reformatione Ecclesie"', in Winfried Eberhard and Franz Machilek (eds.), *Kirchliche Reformimpulse des 14./15. Jahrhunderts in Ostmitteleuropa* (Cologne, 2006), 157–78.

² *Bullarium Poloniae*, ed. Stanisław Kuraś and Irena Sułkowska-Kuraś, iii (Rome and Lublin, 1988), nos. 537–8; *Liber formularum ad ius canonicum spectantium, ex actis Jacobi de Kurdwanow episcopi Plocensis maxima parte depromptarum*, ed. Bolesław Ulanowski, in *Archiwum Komisji Prawniczej Akademii Umiejętności*, i (Cracow, 1895), no. 12.

³ Władysław Abraham, 'Udział Polski w soborze pizańskim 1409', in *Rozprawy Wydziału Historyczno-Filozoficznego Akademii Umiejętności*, xlvii (Cracow, 1905), 140, 148–9; Jerzy Kłoczowski, 'Grzegorz (zm. przed 1425), dominikanin, łaciński biskup włodziński', in *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* (hereafter: PSB), ix (Wrocław, 1960–1), 82; Tadeusz M. Trajdos, *Kościół Katolicki na ziemiach ruskich Korony i Litwy za panowania Władysława II Jagielly (1386–1434)*, i (Wrocław, etc., 1983), 77–80, 101–2, 178.

infrascriptis magistris videlicet: ... M. Johanne de provincia Polonie regente de Cracovia' (p. 86, no. 291). In the supplements to the edition Millet has hypothetically associated the latter with a theologian appearing in the council acts under the date of 28 May 1409 as 'Johannes de Vallemborg' (p. 270), though she had yielded nothing besides these loose conjectures. Yet Polish researchers have equivocally claimed that the matter concerns John of Falkenberg, who was the regent of the Dominican *studium generale* in Cracow for the period 1403/4(?)–5/6 and who participated at the Council of Pisa.⁴

Millet correctly identified the Benedictine abbey in Tyniec, yet did not pay any attention to its abbot, Mściśław ('V.P.D. Meszislau abbas monasterii Tinciensis O.S.B. Cracoviensis diocesis', p. 84). He was abbot of the Tyniec abbey from 1386, dying on 6 November 1410.⁵ Millet did not closer identify Stanisław – the Płock canon and procurator of the bishop of Płock, Jakub of Kurdwanów and the Płock cathedral chapter ('V.V.D. Stanslaus canonicus ecclesie Plocensis, procurator R.D.P. Jacobi episcopi Plocensis'; 'V.V.D. Stanslaus canonicus ecclesie Plocensis, procuratorio nomine capituli ecclesie Plocensis', pp. 109, 144). He placed his signature on the act of deposition of Pope Gregory XII and Benedict XIII: 'Ego Stanislaus cancellarius Plocensis de Rosurzewo reverendi in Christo patris et domini domini Jacobi episcopi Plocensis et capituli procurator ... In quorum testimonium ego Stanislaus me manu propria subscripsi'.⁶ Such source information allows one to state that this was Stanisław, the son of Dobiesław, of the arms of Ciołek, the Płock chapter chancellor for the years 1407–22.⁷

As a result of a review of the commentaries to the edition of the list of council participants, Millet made an interesting discovery referring to the representative of Cracow University at Pisa. On the list in the Turin

⁴ Paweł Kielar, 'Studia nad kulturą szkolną i intelektualną dominikanów prowincji polskiej w średniowieczu', in Jerzy Kłoczowski (ed.), *Studia nad historią dominikanów w Polsce 1222–1972*, i (Warsaw, 1975), 374–5; Maciej Zdanek, *Szkoły i studia dominikanów krakowskich w średniowieczu* (Warsaw, 2005), 108–11; Krzysztof Ożóg, 'Nowe spojrzenie na koncyliaryzm w Polsce XV wieku', *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, cvii, 2 (2000), 126–7; Jakub Turek, 'Regens krakowski Jan z soboru pizańskiego w świetle dwóch traktatów Jana Falkenberga', *Przegląd Tomistyczny*, 16 (2010), 43–57.

⁵ Paweł Szczaniecki, 'Mściśław', in PSB, xxii (1976), 255–6; Tomasz M. Gronowski, *Zwyczajny klasztor, zwyczajni mnisi. Wspólnota tyniecka w średniowieczu* (Cracow, 2007), 310–11.

⁶ Johannes Vincke (ed.), *Schriftstücke zum Pisaner Konzil. Ein Kampf um die öffentliche Meinung* (Bonn, 1942), 203.

⁷ Andrzej Radzimiński, *Pralaci i kanonicy kapituły katedralnej plockiej w XIV i I poł. XV wieku. Studium prozopograficzne*, i: *Pralaci* (Toruń, 1991), 128–9; Zofia Kowalska, *Stanisław Ciołek († 1437), podkanclerzy królewski, biskup poznański, poeta dworski* (Cracow, 1993), 22–3.

manuscript there is no mention of a representative of the Cracow University, as there is an empty space for individual to be written in. On the basis of a letter of the rector and the masters of Cracow University to the council fathers at Pisa, sent on 1 February 1409, it results that the Cracow bishop, Piotr Wysz in fulfilling at the same time the office of chancellor of Cracow University, was so to speak the natural representative of the university at the council forum.⁸ Meanwhile, in another list of council participants discovered by the French medievalist in a manuscript preserved at the Archivio Segreto Vaticano (Arm. LIV, vol. 34, fol. 117) there figures the Dominican 'Johannes Pragel', prior of the Holy Trinity monastery in Cracow as the representative of Cracow University (p. 276). This matter requires detailed research, first and foremost the verification of the reading, and subsequently attempts at the identification of this Dominican. Jan Biskupiec appeared in sources with the title of the prior of the Holy Trinity monastery in Cracow in 1409. We know for a fact that he was in Lublin on 11 April 1409.⁹ At this stage there is no means of identifying the two figures on the basis of the Vatican list.

The subsequent study in the present volume: 'La représentativité, source de la légitimité du concile de Pise (1409)', pp. 285–308, was published for the first time in the collected work: *Théologie et droit dans la science politique de l'État moderne* (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 147 [Rome, 1991], pp. 241–61). It refers to the key problem of the Council of Pisa, i.e. its legality, for it was not called into being by both of the popes: the Roman Pope Gregory XII and Pope Benedict XIII at Avignon, but was convened by the cardinals from both of the obediences. Millet shows the failures in attempts to restore Church unity and the route leading to the cardinals' decisions to call a council, as well as the discussion of lawyers and theologians into the legality of this council assembly. The author emphasises that one of the fundamental arguments for it was the large number of its participants, that reached around 500 persons, representing the Roman Church (including 24 cardinals, around 90 archbishops and bishops, over 100 abbots and 50 representatives of the monastic orders, over 80 royal envoys, 20 university delegates as well as numerous procurators representing archbishops, bishops, abbots and cathedral chapters). This was an argument often cited by the council fathers, while the list of its participants was widely disseminated within Christian Europe, which in Millet's opinion was a conscious act of propaganda on the part of the Council of Pisa. She has noted the important and positive role of the 1409 council in the process of restoring unity to the Church.

⁸ Abraham, 'Udział Polski', 134–5, 151–3.

⁹ Ożóg, 'Nowe spojrzenie', 126–7; Krzysztof Kaczmarek, *Szkoły i studia polskich dominikanów w okresie średniowiecza* (Poznań, 2005), 476–7; Zdanek, *Szkoły i studia*, 110–11; *idem*, 'Regensi dominikańskiego Studium Generalnego w Krakowie do 1596 r.', *Przegląd Tomistyczny*, 16 (2010), 111–12.

Hélène Millet has devoted a separate study to the participants of the Council of Pisa who came from the French kingdom ('Les Français du Royaume au concile de Pise [1409], pp. 309–46, published for the first time in: *Crises et réformes dans l'Église. De la réforme grégorienne à la Préréforme. Actes du 115e Congrès national des Sociétés savantes* (Paris, 1991, pp. 123–33). On the basis of ten preserved lists of those participating in the said council, the author has drawn up a register of 162 participants from France. She has in doing this conducted a detailed analysis of this group within the context of the entire council gathering and has brought into question the previously held view in historiography that the French numerically dominated the council. The author shows that in terms of numerical representation there were as many Italians at Pisa.

The study entitled: 'La culture des clercs angevins et provençaux envoyés au concile de Pise (1409)', pp. 347–81 (published for the first time in: Jean-Michel Matz and Marie-Madeleine de Cevins [eds.], *Formation intellectuelle et culture du clergé dans les territoires angevins [milieu du XIIIe – fin du XVe siècle]* [Rome, 2005], pp. 313–38) is of a somewhat different character, for it concerns the intellectual picture of eighteen council participants, who represented Anjou and Provence. Millet has presented a collective portrait of this group, first and foremost the varied political, social and Church relations of the individuals concerned, as well as their university education and various careers and intellectual activity. The author devotes a lot of attention to figures such as: Pierre Flamenc, Honorat Bovet and Vital Valentin.

The volume concludes with the study 'La participation du Portugal au concile de Pise (1409)' (pp. 383–407), a work that appeared in print for the first time in: *A Igreja e o Clero Portugêses no Contexto Europeu* ([Lisbon, 2005], pp. 235–54). The author initially identifies six Portuguese on the Pisa lists and then shows their careers and the circumstances surrounding their delegation to the council, as well as their activities at the council forum.

Hélène Millet studies herein described, ones devoted to various aspects of the council of Pisa, as well as the critical edition of the extensive list of council participants, published together in a single volume, brings the reader an immense number of detailed findings on, first and foremost, those who created the council assembly. The persistence in acquainting one with this numerous group, a group upon which the fate of the Church and its reforms at the beginning of the fifteenth century depended, is to the great service of this French medievalist. Here the research superbly complements the attainments of world medievalism within this particular field, as well as simultaneously inspiring one to complex studies into the prosopography of the Council of Pisa fathers, for there still remains a lot to be done within this field.

Yvonne Kleinmann (ed.), *Kommunikation durch symbolische Akte. Religiöse Heterogenität und politische Herrschaft in Polen-Litauen*, Stuttgart, 2010, Franz Steiner Verlag, 305 pp., indexes, bibliog., ill., series: Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kultur des Östlichen Mitteleuropa, 35

The book is a collection of articles by Polish and German historians. Their aim was to present the significance of symbols and symbolic acts within communication between religious and denominational communities inhabiting the Polish-Lithuanian state, as well as to show in what ways the said symbols constituted an instrument for political authority.

The work is composed of four parts. The first of these is theoretical-methodological in character and functions as an introduction. It contains two articles presenting different propositions for research into religiosity – from the view point of anthropology as well as theories of social systems. The remaining three parts each contain four articles, in which the authors present on the basis of concrete examples various forms of interdenominational communication.

The first part, 'Teoretische und methodische Zugänge', commences with a piece by Volker Gottwik, who illustrates the mutual inspiration – with regard to method and research aims – of anthropology and history. For the task of both of these disciplines is the understanding of culture in the spatial and temporal sense. In referring to Clifford Geertz the author underlines that the key to an understanding of foreign culture is acquaintance with the system of symbols inherent to it, for he understands beneath the concept of symbol, i.a. language, ritual, the system of kinship. While Christian Preuß relates to the views of Niklas Luhmann, the German sociologist and lawyer, the creator of theories of social systems. Referring to his research he discusses the fundamental concepts of religion, communication and evolution. He also examines the question of expanse and the body as a means of communication. In reflecting upon the primary conditions for social order (communication, the media, language) he emphasises the role of the symbol, which enhances communication through a reduction in the complexity of the social system.

In the second part, 'Religiöse Heterogenität und Herrschaftspraxis', Michael G. Müller examines the question of denominational coexistence and religious peaces instigated in East-Central Europe of the early modern period. The author contrasts the political and legal regulations adopted in the Commonwealth, the Czech lands, Hungary and Transylvania with the religious peace concluded at Augsburg in 1555 regulating the relations between Catholics and Lutherans within the German Reich. He shows that in these countries there existed various forms of religious toleration. These were motivated by practical considerations, with the desire to preserve the

social and political integrality of the state in relation to the denominational and religious diversity of the populace being an important reason for the said.

Adam Kaźmierczyk has undertaken a study into the legal status of Jews settling on magnate estates, in private towns and small towns. The magnates interested in the settlement of their *latifundia* guaranteed for the Jewish settlers not only the freedom to trade and engage in craft, but also respect for their religion. They agreed to fully functioning synagogues, Jewish schools and the construction of cemeteries. This turned them into a grouping separate from the rest of society in legal and religious terms. The author presents also the changes which occurred in this group's situation under the influence of the Enlightenment debate on the place of Jews within the social structure of the Commonwealth.

Christopher Augustynowicz has devoted his article to the royal city of Sandomierz. He draws attention to the significance of this centre during the period of the Reformation, when first the teachings of Martin Luther and subsequently John Calvin arrived. In 1570 there was signed here the so-called Sandomierz Agreement. From 1602 there simultaneously functioned in the city a Jesuit College, which was to constitute an important centre for the Catholic Counter Reformation. In discussing the presence within the city of 'foreigners': Scots, Greeks and Jews, Augustynowicz examines a series of questions, for example, ritual murders, over which the Jews were accused. According to the author they expressed, in a symbolic way, the presence of a fear of 'others' within the social consciousness.

At the centre of interest for Tetiana Grygoriewa are the diplomatic relations between the Commonwealth and the Ottoman Empire. The author's reflections concentrate on the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when Ottoman diplomacy was still only to a small degree 'Europeanised'. In analysing the diaries and accounts of Commonwealth ambassadors from their missions in Istanbul, she examines the effectiveness exerted by the various ceremonies and rituals that dominated at the Sultan's court. Consequently she attempts to determine to what degree communication by means of the symbolic language of diplomatic ceremonies was effective.

In part three, 'Grenzkonstruktionen', Myroslava Keryk presents the meaning and possibilities in the application of art for the creation of a religious identity within the relatively varied denominational society. Her case study is Lwów, inhabited by Catholics, Orthodox, Uniates, Armenians and Jews. The analysis covers two questions: the attempts by religious leaders to utilise art as a means of influence on the faithful as well as a way of raising the prestige of their church; and as sources of influence for artists. The author discusses the phenomena and objects relating to the three faiths: the Catholic painters' guild called into being by the Lwów archbishop Jan Dymitr Solikowski in 1597, the activities of Jewish artists, the St George Cathedral in Lwów built in the mid-eighteenth century following the acceding of the

cathedral to the Union of Brest and the demolition of the old Gothic temple. The author's analysis leads to the conclusion that Lwów art expressed to a greater degree the interaction of one denominational grouping on another than it constituted the cementing as its result of interdenominational borders.

Judith Kalik looks at the question of sexual relations between Jews and Christians. This has not been hitherto a subject of systematic research; her article is an attempt at presenting several types of such relations. The author illustrates them on two levels – the imaginary and the real. In the first case recourse is made to the legend about Esther, the Jewish lover of King Casimir the Great, which may be analysed as a love story but also one depicting the deep rooted fear and hidden desires of Polish Jews. In the second case the author discusses the relations between Jewish men and Christian women as well as Christian men and Jewish women, pointing to the bans and restrictions enforced on such relationships on the part of both religious communities.

Magda Teter's field of interest are the judicial decisions of secular courts in religious matters. The author accepts as a premise that the construction of borders between various denominational communities takes place by means of language, rituals and theology. These three questions constitute the basis of her analysis of court cases into the theft of articles of cult from sacred buildings. The sentences passed in these cases bear witness, in her opinion, to the arbitrariness of the legal system of the time, which in its evaluation of categories of crime was directed exclusively by Catholic values. For only in cases where the thefts concerned Catholic churches were they treated as sacrilege, in the cases of other temples – merely as ordinary theft. The judicial decisions of the judges reflected at the same time the denominational hierarchy in force.

Jan Doktor has devoted his article to the Frankists, a sect founded by Jacob Frank in the eighteenth century. The group defies a straightforward classification as it derived its inspiration from the legacies of various denominations and religions – Judaism, Christianity and Islam. The Frankists rejected in their doctrine Mosaic law and the Talmud, yet though agreeing to Catholic baptism they retained Jewish rituals, while at the same time their language of communication was Polish. Equally characteristic for the group was adoption of noble surnames and their distinctive style of dress. A distinguishing feature of their sect was the cult of Shekhinah, in place of the Catholic cult of the Virgin Mary. The Frankist example shows that the borders between faiths are sometimes difficult to precisely define.

In part four, 'Kommunikation durch symbolische Akte', Hanna Węgrzynek deals with the problem of compromise as a method of communication and the settling of conflicts between various social groups. The matter is discussed by the author on the basis of the example of relations between the Franciscans and the Jewish population in seventeenth-century Lublin. In presenting both

the history of the Jewish community as equally the circumstances leading to the establishment of the monks in the city, she shows the main sources of misunderstandings between them as well as the subsequent compromises reached. This form of interfaith communication, which manifested mutual respect and the equivalence of both sides, is contrasted with acts of symbolic and physical violence, i.a., Catholic processions held in Jewish districts, desecration of synagogues, the defiling of corpses. These expressed the dominant position held by Catholics.

In the next article Damian Tricoire concentrates on the symbolic meaning of the act of crowning the Virgin Mary as Queen of Poland; during the ceremony in 1656 conducted at the Lwów cathedral, the so-called Lwów Oath, King John Casimir proclaimed the Virgin Mary to be the patron and queen of his state. Through an analysis of the religious literature the author indicates the particular stages in the constructing of the Marian idea of patronage proving that this was an important element in the process of the Catholic confessionalisation of the Commonwealth. Its effect was the making of Jasna Góra the centre of Polish religious life, though its political repercussions were also significant – the Marian cult was to become an important symbol of Polish statehood.

Yvonne Kleinmann's area of interest are privileges as legal acts regulating the relations between various social and religious groupings on a local level. The matter is explored by the author on the example of the urban and guild privileges of the Rzeszów latifundium, examining them in relation to established norms, their narratives as well as the religious symbolism they contained. Within this context the public announcement of privileges is described as a form of ritual, while the content of this transfer as the symbolic communication of the owner's policy in relation to the urban community. At the level of researching the narrative appearing in the privileges the author concentrates on the question of reflection in the privileges for the religiously diverse population of Rzeszów. In examining the religious symbolism appearing in it she notes that a pursuit to preserve neutrality in questions of faith is visible.

Stefan Rohdewald devotes his article to the figure of St Josaphat Kuncewicz, the first Uniate bishop of Polotsk, murdered in 1623 by opponents of the Union of Brest. During the course of the seventeenth century a cult of the saint, starting from the local level, developed into one of state proportions, expression of which was the recognition in 1673 of Josaphat as one of the main patrons of the Commonwealth. The author emphasises that this cult developed independently of differences in beliefs, ethnicity and social division. He shows at the same time the symbolic meaning of the saint for the shaping of the Uniate confessional identity on the one hand, while on the other the strivings of the Catholic Church to dominate the Union of 1596.

The book under discussion is especially of interest to researchers involved in the denominational issues of the Commonwealth in the early modern

times. The subject of the relations between the various denominational and religious groupings it addresses means that it incorporates itself within the presently popular current amongst historians of research into the multiculturalism of the Commonwealth. Although a lot has already been written on the subject of denominational minorities within the Polish-Lithuanian state, the position under review is worthy of note. For in its references to the achievements of other academic disciplines, in this case anthropology and sociology, it has given a possibility for those questions addressed to be viewed from a different perspective. The authors, in basing themselves on their hitherto research, have concentrated on the symbolic moments within interdenominational and interfaith relations. An undoubted virtue of the book is its presentation of the problem area both on a state level as equally examining the questions on a local plane, e.g. on the example of a concrete locality. One reservation, though one in no way detracting from the value of the work, is the concentration, first and foremost, on relations between the interrelationships of Catholic, Uniate and Jewish populations. The expansion of the considerations to encompass Protestant communities would undoubtedly constitute an interesting supplement to the study.

trans. Guy Torr

Marta Kuc

Andrzej Gil and Witold Bobryk (eds.), *On the Border of the Worlds: Essays about the Orthodox and Uniate Churches in Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages and the Modern Period*, Siedlce and Lublin, 2010, Akademia Podlaska and Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 186 pp.

The aim set by the editors of the volume was to show a varied and representative picture of the history and culture of the Orthodox and Uniate Churches in the late Middle Ages and the early modern period. Polish, Russian and Ukrainian historians presented in their works the organisational structures, cultural currents as well as the question of the political consciousness of adherents of Orthodoxy.

Ihor Skochyliias, of the Ukrainian Catholic University, in the article 'From sacred space to administrative model of Church governing: the organisation of the territory of the Halych (Lviv) Eparchy in the medieval and early modern period', has undertaken an examination of the territorial organisation of the Orthodox diocese in Lwów as well as the prerogatives of bishops. He has also taken into consideration the factor of the Eucharistic tradition and the role of the rulers in the shaping of unity amongst the territory's inhabitants. To begin with the author emphasises the influence of the Orthodox Church on the

process of building the area's Ruthenian identity, discussing at fair length the conditions for shaping the local community and its self-identification. An important role was performed in this process by the ruling family, the Ruriks. The author conjures up a vision of a state in which the prince appeared as its head, the land constituted the trunk of this body, with the feet being the subjects (a concept strikingly similar to one presented several centuries later on the cover of *Leviathan* by Thomas Hobbes [1651]). While the heart was the Church, uniting all the parts of this body. The moulding of the Lwów diocese territory was linked to the authority of the Kiev metropolis, while the means for its governance derived from the prerogatives of bishops, here known as *vladikas*. They were responsible not only for the organisational side of Church functioning on the territories assigned to them, but also for the redemption of the faithful. The powers of the bishops of the Kiev metropolis had remained almost unchanged since the Middle Ages up until the eighteenth century, and also within the area of the Lwów diocese even after the introduction there in 1700 of Church union. However, already earlier, from the mid-seventeenth century, a Eucharistic, traditional model for the exertion of bishopric authority, one derived from the Middle Ages, was, as a result of the reform of Peter Mohila, and subsequently the Uniate Synod of Zamość of 1720, superseded by new ideas. This may be noted in, i.a., the approach towards borders (a linear understanding) or the role of the bishop in a diocese. However, over a long duration from the twelfth to the eighteenth century, not only the borders but also the factor of tradition as well as the organised apparatus of coercion allowed for the creation of an organised structure for the Lwów diocese out of the territories that had constituted a cultural mosaic.

Mikhail Dmitriev, a Russian historian also well known in the West¹ involved in the history of Christianity, chiefly Orthodoxy and the reformational (and pre-reformational) movements in the Grand Duchy of Moscow as well as within the Ruthenian territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania,² has here contributed the article 'Humanism and traditional Orthodox culture of Eastern Europe: the problem of compatibility (15th–17th centuries)'. We shall devote a little more attention to the work in hand. The author refers to the conformity of Western humanistic currents as well as the traditions of Orthodox culture from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century, advancing the thesis that Western humanism was not to have much influence within

¹ Was invited to contribute to the monumental history of Christianity published several years ago by Cambridge University Press – Mikhail Dmitriev, 'Western Christianity and Eastern Orthodoxy' in R. Po-chia Hsia (ed.), *Reform and Expansion, 1500–1660* (The Cambridge History of Christianity, 6, Cambridge, 2007), 321–42, 666–72.

² *Idem, Pravoslavie i reformatsiya. Reformatsiennyye dvizheniya v vostochnoslavianskikh zemlyakh Rechi Pospolitoi vo vtoroi polovine XVI v.* (Moscow, 1990).

the territorial area of Russia, as equally was the case for today's Belarus and the Ukraine, where, on the whole, eastern Slavonic writers remained under the strong influence of Byzantium. In explaining the origin of such a state of affairs he notes that certain trends close in nature to Renaissance humanism made their appearance within the Orthodox part of Europe from 1470 to 1590 (he gives, as an example, the Judaizers' movement, whose representatives dabbled in religious literature based on Jewish and Muslim texts, as well as translating the Old Testament). Equally the Orthodox, in favouring the so-called *studia humanitatis* left their mark on Russian and Ruthenian (Belarussian and Ukrainian) culture, which the author illustrates through the activities of the reformist movement in Eastern monasticism. This was exemplified by the so-called non-Possessors, who were active at the end of the fifteenth century. They held a critical position in relation to the written tradition of the Church, postulating a restoration of monasticism and the abolishing of the death penalty for religious dissidents. Dmitriev also underlines the role of Maxim Grek, who following his stay in Italy, conversion to Catholicism and subsequent reconversion to Orthodoxy, was invited from Mount Athos to Moscow, where he was to spend forty years. He was to use his skills in the translation of numerous works from Greek and Latin. In the mid-sixteenth century there was to appear a new generation of Judaizers, from amongst whom the author draws attention to Teodozy Kosy (Teodosii Kosoi) and his companions. They escaped to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania where they debated with Polish and Lithuanian Calvinists, including Jan Łaski the younger, being surprised of their similar approach to, e.g. questions of understanding the Eucharist. Printing houses were being founded at this time in Moscow, schools for the clergy; there was observed a development in historical writings, the undertaking of translations from Latin and Greek, the extending of official invitations for numerous foreigners to visit, as well as the implementation of internal reforms. These tendencies were stopped during the period of *oprichnina*. Dmitriev also draws attention to the activities of Prince Andrei Kurbski in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and during a later period within the Commonwealth, who, after his escape from Moscow, settled on lands where the influence of humanism was significant. Following on from a presentation of these facts Dmitriev raises the question as to whether we can talk about humanistic tendencies in Slavonic Orthodox culture? In answering he notes that even though the aforementioned activists on the whole used Western texts and inspirations as well as at times presenting for themselves ideas highly concurrent with Western humanism. In their cases we are, however, dealing with something different than the accomplishments of humanists. He illustrates this difference on the basis of the position of Calvinists of Ruthenian origin to the question of rejecting the cult of icons. According to the author, they treated this problem as one of the most important, while in the rejection of this cult they perceived

a rejection of divine incarnation, for the whole theology of the icon was connected with issues of the Holy Trinity and the dual nature of Christ. In the 'Western' depiction of affairs, iconoclasm found itself on the edge of important questions, besides which it was perceived as a struggle with the adoration of idols. Explaining in turn the differences in the approach to humanist ideas amongst the representatives of Western and Eastern Europe, the author shows that the Christianised, neo-Platonic tradition was comprehended in a different way in the East and the West, something that was to translate itself into cultural phenomena. The general emphasis he lends to the matter is the deep-rooted difference between the Orthodox-Byzantine and Western context for Christian anthropology. It follows for us here to note, however, that the author – though admittedly seeing the activities of Kosy and Kurbski within the Orthodox territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and then the Commonwealth, as well as the reaching out for Western models for the reforms of Orthodox brotherhoods – has concentrated his attention on the work of individuals from Moscow. Possibly it is this that explains this undeniable state of affairs. It would appear, however, that despite being raised in an Orthodox tradition, many representatives of the Ruthenians from the territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania or subsequently, in the sixteenth century, the Commonwealth, found themselves under the influence of Western culture and ideological currents as a result of education obtained at German or Italian universities, contact with magnate courts, the employment of foreign tutors for their children. While though possibly at the source of the intellectual development of these individuals there did indeed lie a deep Byzantine-Orthodox tradition, they already manifested attitudes strongly connected with humanistic currents and the thinking of the Reformation. The representatives of this group are widely known in Polish and Belarussian literature on the subject, Vasil Ciapinski, worried about the disappearance of the Ruthenian language amongst Ruthenians, as well as Ostafi Volovich, who being deeply convinced that he answered before God for the souls of his subjects ordered them to attend Calvinist services, putting into effect with the same the known principle in the West of *cuius regio eius religio*. In our opinion such aspects of Ruthenian attitudes from the territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania should also be taken into consideration. Western ideas did have, despite everything, easier accessibility, and at the same time the possibility to shape the intellectual formations of their recipients. Consequently the perceiving of the Rus' of Muscovy and Lithuanian Rus' as being a cultural monolith in the sixteenth century is not, in our opinion, justifiable. The text under discussion is one to induce further discussion and polemics.

In the subsequent article ('Stauropagic Brotherhood of Vilno and brotherhood monastery as the most important Orthodox centre in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the end of the 16th and in the 17th centuries') Tomasz Kempa of the Nicolaus Copernicus University of Toruń recalls in a solid and

detailed manner the origin of Orthodox brotherhoods going back to the mid-fifteenth century as well as the history and role of the Wilno brotherhood of the Holy Spirit and the monastery under the same name. Both the monastery and the brotherhood were to become the most important Orthodox centre in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania by the end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth century. The author emphasises the elitism of the brotherhood as well as the main aims of its activities: extraction from the cultural-educational crisis, defence of the Orthodox Church in conflict with Protestants and Catholics, and later, following the concluding of the Union of Brest, also the struggle to regain the position of the official Church. He also notes the efforts of the monks to maintain independence from the metropolitan and the bishops, to whom reforms were proposed, with the aim of strengthening the Orthodox Church (these covered, e.g., the return of monastic property illegally leased by the bishops). In the day of the Union of Brest the Orthodox monastery of the Holy Spirit and the brotherhood decisively came out against the Union, conducting an active, anti-Union campaign, which brought with it even royal intervention. It maintained its position, however, playing the role of the most important Orthodox centre within the Commonwealth. Kempa points to three main reasons for this state of affairs: it was the only centre within the middle of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania that so strongly stood out against Church union; its membership utilised in their political struggle skilful arguments; the brotherhood defended its economic position, despite the efforts of the metropolitan, Hipacy Pocij, designed to take over the brotherhood's and monastery's property. The atmosphere improved under the rule of Ladislas IV, together with the renewed legalisation of the Orthodox hierarchy within the Commonwealth. However, the wars of the second half of the seventeenth century contributed to the gradual decline of the brotherhood and the monastery. The author rejects the views of Russian historians who claim that the Orthodox population of Wilno welcomed the Russian army with 'bread and salt'. Their loyalty to the Commonwealth was even noted by the monarch in 1661. However, the increasing instance of conversion to Catholicism amongst the Orthodox nobility as well as the gradually less numerous representation of the disunited amongst urban authorities resulted in the role played by not only the brotherhoods but also by Orthodoxy in its entirety within the Commonwealth was to become increasingly marginal.

It is worth drawing attention to the article 'Prince Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski and the "single-faith" Muscovy', which constitutes an additional contribution to the matter of relations of the Commonwealth's Orthodox inhabitants to the state. Leonid Tymoshenko from the State Pedagogical University of Drokhobych presents an interesting study of the position taken by the most powerful Orthodox magnate in the Commonwealth, Prince Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski in relation to a denominationally identical Moscow,

polemicalising with the statement of Mikhail Dmitriev on the cultural unity of Russia, as equally the Ukraine and Belarus in the sixteenth century. The author also draws attention to the fact that in Russian historiography there has started to be perceived a specificity in feature in the functioning of Kiev-Ruthenian Christianity when compared to the Orthodoxy of Muscovy. Once again he examines the question of the Prince's consciousness. He considers that approach adopted by Tomasz Hodana³ to be insufficient and underlines that Ostrogski's relations with Moscow were at times far from peaceful. The nature of these relations was influenced (a character difficult to categorise in positions of 'positive/negative') by issues such as: Polish-Muscovy political relations, the problem of the Union of Brest, the dependence of the Orthodox Kievan metropolis on the pro-Muscovy patriarch in Constantinople.

The next article examines the question of the Uniate Church. Andrzej Gil of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin presents research into 'The first images and the beginning of the cult of the archbishop of Polotsk, Josaphat Kuncewicz in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth till the mid-17th century'. He starts from a presentation of the killing of the Uniate Church hierarch as a unique event within the lands of the Commonwealth (although it is a shame that in the English edition he has not given even a short examination of the circumstances that led up to this tragedy). Next he analyses the details of the process of beatification and the attempts for canonisation in the second half of the seventeenth century, as well as the shaping of the image of the saint. Initially there were semi-figural representations, subsequently depicting him in a full figure, with time enriched with attributes, such as a palm – the symbol of martyrdom, or an axe – the symbol of the instrument of crime. The figure of the future saint⁴ was equally depicted in sculpture (1642). The author also recounts the stages in the transformation of the cult of Kuncewicz within the Commonwealth.

In the final article, Witold Bobryk of the University of Podlasie solidly and clearly describes the 'Rite changes in the Uniate dioceses of Chełm in the 18th century'. At the beginning of the Uniate Church's functioning these changes were not that great and were connected first and foremost with the need to adapt, for example, the liturgy to Catholic theology. The mid-seventeenth century already saw the introduction of recited Masses, during which it was forbidden to sing. The scope of changes also differed

³ Tomasz Hodana, *Między królem a carem. Moskwa w oczach prawosławnych Rusinów – obywateli Rzeczypospolitej (na podstawie piśmiennictwa końca XVI – połowy XVII stulecia)* (Cracow, 2008). It is also worth remembering that Prince Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski's relations with the Commonwealth have been equally dealt with in Tomasz Kempa's biography, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski (ok. 1524/1525–1608), wojewoda kijowski i marszałek ziemi wołyńskiej* (Toruń, 1997), 43–83.

⁴ Josaphat Kuncewicz was canonised in 1867.

regionally, for up until the eighteenth century Uniate priests were known to conduct Masses on the basis of Orthodox books, despite the clear decrees of the Church hierarchy and attempts at unifying the service in the first quarter of the eighteenth century. According to the author, in the case of the Uniate diocese of Chełm, such a state of affairs resulted for several reasons: Union was accepted by individual parishes within the diocese at different times, the noticeable mixing of believers of both rites was conducive for an acceptance of certain elements characteristic for the Catholic Church, finally the traditional domestic education of candidates for Uniate priests linked with the custom of inheritance of the parish also favoured this (for a priest seminary was founded only in 1759). The introduction of changes to the Eastern rite depended on the stance of the patrons of churches, who as a rule already belonged to the Catholic Church and wished for the service to be conducted also on feast days according to the Gregorian Calendar. A similarly significant change was the development of the cult of the Holy Sacrament and the spreading of the custom of Corpus Christi processions. Proof of these changes was the growing number of monstrances in Uniate churches as equally the unwillingness to locate iconostases with the intention of differentiating Uniate churches from Orthodox ones; a similar aim was served by other changes in the external appearance of temples. Also the praying of the rosary or litany to the Virgin Mary, the celebration of Marian feast days as well as the popularising of the cult of Josaphat Kuncewicz made the Uniate rite similar to the Catholic. An attempt at preserving Uniate identity turned out to be at the end of the eighteenth century the practice of employing cantors and the conducting of a sung Mass on Sundays and feast days. All the earlier changes had, however, enrooted themselves deeply in the consciousness of the Uniate flock, resulting also in, according to the author, the construction of a specific separate Uniate Church identity.

The authors of the articles presented in the book deal with subject matters that they have been engaged in previously (e.g. Dmitriev,⁵ Kempa,⁶ Gil,⁷ Bobryk⁸).

⁵ Cf. footnote 1.

⁶ Tomasz Kempa, 'Wileńskie bractwo Św. Ducha jako centrum obrony prawosławia w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w końcu XVI i w pierwszej połowie XVII w.', *Białoruskie Zeszyty Historyczne*, 21 (2004), 47–79.

⁷ Andrzej Gil, 'Kult Jozafata Kuncewicza i jego pierwsze przedstawienia ikonowe w Rzeczypospolitej (do połowy XVII wieku). Zarys problematyki' in *idem* (ed.), *Kościół wschodnie w Rzeczypospolitej XVI–XVIII wieku. Zbiór studiów* (Studia i materiały do dziejów chrześcijaństwa wschodniego w Rzeczypospolitej, 3, Lublin, 2005).

⁸ Witold Bobryk, 'Problem zmiany obrządku na terenie unickiej eparchii chełmskiej w XVIII w.' in Victor V. Kirienko (ed.), *Mentalitet Slavyan i integratsionnye protsessy: istoriya, sovremennost', perspektivy. Materialy III mezhdunarodnoy nauchnoy konferentsii* (Gomel', 2003).

Consequently the said works constitute an English language promotion of research conducted by them earlier and which was published originally in Polish, Russian or Ukrainian. This presentation in a single volume of important findings by historians researching the Eastern Churches and their various application to the conflicts and tensions dividing the said is of value in its own right. It is also worth mentioning that Poles (and not only they) increasingly less often, unfortunately, are able to use the Cyrillic alphabet and more often know English than any of the Slavonic languages of the East and therefore are more readily able to make use of the reading material herein provided for works by Dmitriev, Skochylias, Bobryk or Tymoshenko. The publication is equally an important element in the promoting of the Polish authors included. It also constitutes an example of historians being 'without borders'.

trans. Guy Torr

Marzena Liedke

Dmitriï V. Sen', *Kazachestvo Dona i Severo-Zapadnogo Kavkaza v otnosheniyakh s musul'manskimi gosudarstvami Prichernomor'ya (vtoraya polovina XVII v. – nachalo XVIII v.)* [The Cossacks of the Don and of the North-Western Caucasus in Their Relations with the Muslim States of the Black Sea Region (Second Half of the Seventeenth Century – Beginning of the Eighteenth Century)], Rostov-on-Don, 2009, Izdatel'stvo Yuzhnogo Federal'nogo Universiteta, 280 pp., bibliog.

A valuable impact of postmodernism on historiography has been the ennoblement of views once expressed by dissident or marginal groups vs. the 'mainstream' views, long deemed as representing the 'genuine historical progress'. Not by accident so many studies on 'renegades' have been published in the recent decades.¹ The new trend has influenced not only the historiography of absolutist states in Europe, but also the historiography of Euroasian empires. For instance, numerous scholars studying the Ottoman Empire have abandoned the once dominant centralistic perspective, offered by the central archives in Istanbul and representing the views of the Ottoman central bureaucracy. Instead, much more attention has been paid to local chronicles, court registers, private letters and diaries, or even tombstone inscriptions. Today we know much more about the mentality and internal

¹ To give just one example, see the already classic monograph by Bartolomé Bennassar and Lucile Bennassar, *Les Chrétiens d'Allah. L'histoire extraordinaire des renégats XVIe–XVIIe siècles* (Paris, 1989).

world of individuals, Muslim as well as non-Muslim, male as well as female, who once inhabited the domains ruled by the Ottoman sultans.

Now this wave seems to approach one of the last bulwarks of state-oriented historiography, namely the historiography of tsarist Russia. Admittedly, any scholar who has worked in the Russian archives must be fascinated with the amount of material produced and amassed by the Russian bureaucratic machine. Both the admirers of Petrine reforms and Russia's military prowess and those who maintain that Stalinist genocidal tyranny was rooted in the autocratic tradition of old Muscovy² will share a belief in the effectiveness of the Russian state and the high level of state control over the Russian subjects, reaching back to the early modern, if not medieval era. Yet, the very same Russian archives, both central and provincial, contain material that – if carefully studied – gives one access to the mental world of Russian individuals³ and dissidents, demonstrating that the tsar's authority was by far not unquestionable to many a Muscovian subject.

In his monograph Dmitrii Sen' focuses on two massive Cossack migrations to the domains of Muslim rulers, effected at the end of the seventeenth century and in the first decade of the following century. The first wave of migration resulted from the conflict between the Old Believers, who had escaped religious persecutions in central Russia and found shelter and massive support among the Don Cossacks, and those Cossacks who chose to obey the tsar's orders by embracing Patriarch Nikon's religious reforms and assisting military expeditions sent by the government to suppress the 'schism'.⁴ In

² In the cold war era, such view was popularised in the West by Karl Wittfogel's classic: *Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power* (1st edn, New Haven, 1957).

³ A fascinating glimpse into the individual identities of Russian subjects has been recently offered by Aleksandr Lavrov, who has studied the petitions of the tsar's subjects, both male and female, who had been asking for material support having returned from captivity in the Ottoman Empire or the Crimean Khanate; see *idem*, 'Voennyi plen i rabstvo na granitsakh Osmianskoï imperii i Rossiiskogo gosudarstva v 17 – nachale 18 veka', in <http://www.perspectivia.net/content/publikationen/vortraege-moskau/lavrov_kriegsgefangenschaft> [Accessed 25 June 2011]; *idem*, 'Captivity, Slavery and Gender: Muscovite Female Captives in the Crimean Khanate and in the Ottoman Empire', paper read at the conference: 'Slavery, Ransom and Liberation in Russia and the Steppe Area, 1500–2000', held in Aberdeen on 15–16 June 2009 (to be published soon). I wish to thank the author for letting me quote this text before publication.

⁴ Interestingly, the Cossack dissidents accused Nikon of having infected the Orthodoxy with Latin Catholicism, which they identified with Poland ('v cerkvakh gde nyne stala Pol'sha'; pp. 110–11). Strangely enough, their repulsion towards the Polish Catholicism did not deter the Don Cossacks from favourably receiving in 1685 the agents of the Polish King John III Sobieski, who tried to recruit them

result of the civil war that culminated on the Don in the years 1688–9, the defeated Old Believers, accompanied by their families and clergymen, chose to escape persecution and established settlements in Daghestan (on the Kuma river and on a branch of the Sulak river named Agrakhan) and in Kuban. The refugees compared their migration to the Biblical Exodus and referred to contemporary Russia as the domain of anti-Christ (*udel antikhrista*), accepting at the same time their subjection towards the Muslim rulers.

The second wave occurred after the failed Cossack insurrection of Kondratii Bulavin (1707–8), after whose death the command over the rebels was taken over by Ignat Nekrasov, a charismatic leader who led the defeated Cossacks to Kuban and accepted a shared Ottoman-Crimean patronage. His followers, thereafter known as *Nekrasovtsy* (Nekrasov Cossacs), participated in the Ottoman-Russian war of 1711–13 on the Muslim side and, after the Peace of Edirne (1713), were reconfirmed in their new holdings on the two sides of the Kuban river. After these lands had been lost to Russia, the *Nekrasovtsy* were resettled by Ottoman authorities to Anatolia and Dobrudja, where they survived as a separate community until the twentieth century. Interestingly, during the Crimean War, a Polish émigré turned Ottoman general, Michał Czajkowski (after conversion to Islam he adopted a new name Sadik Pasha), recruited the *Nekrasovtsy* along with Polish emigrants to his corps of Ottoman Cossacks in order to fight against Russia at the side of the allied coalition.

In spite of their unruliness, epitomised by the rebellion of Stepan Razin (1670–1), the Don Cossacks have been traditionally viewed in historiography – both Russian and foreign – as the tsar’s ‘natural’ subjects, speaking the same language and sharing the same religion as ‘ordinary’ Russians. In common view, the Cossacks’ allegiance towards Russia was further strengthened by their folklore and collective identity, in which the struggle against Muslim ‘infidels’ played a dominant role.

Yet, the narrative provided by Sen’ questions some of the established truths. The author gives examples of Muslim Turks and Tatars, who lived among the Don Cossacks, as well as Cossacks, who lived among the Muslims. He also challenges the view that the ultimate Christianisation of Kuban and the North-Western Caucasus occurred through the policy of the Russian state, seeing the process as resulting rather from spontaneous settlement and proselytising activity of individuals, whose allegiance towards the Muscovian patriarchy was more than questionable (p. 102).⁵

for the Holy League at the time when the tsar was still at peace with both the khan and the sultan (pp. 81–2).

⁵ A distant, though striking, analogy can be provided by the process of Islamisation of Bengal, in which individual settlers and dervishes played a much more important role than the official policy of the Great Moghul court in distant Delhi; see Richard Eaton, *The Rise of Islam and the Bengal Frontier, 1204–1760* (Berkeley, 1993).

According to Sen', having settled in Kuban, the Cossacks formed decent relations with neighbouring Nogays and displayed a striking loyalty towards their new Muslim lords. As late as in 1860, a traveler who encountered former Kuban Cossacks living in Anatolia, recorded their statement: 'in whichever master's domain we live, we serve him with our Cossack faith and oath, according to our honour, without any fraud or treason' (*u kakogo tsarya zhivëm ... tomu i sluzhim, veroï i pravdoï kazatskoï, po chesti, bez lzhi i izmeny*; p. 256). In return, the khans and the sultans granted their new Christian subjects religious and social autonomy, and even provided for their spiritual needs. For instance, in the 1690s, a group of Kuban Cossacks asked the Ottoman governor of Azov to send them a 'Russian priest' (*ruskago popa*; p. 176).

The author argues that the rapprochement between the Don Cossacks and the Crimean khans in the late seventeenth century resulted from Moscow's centralising policy, which endangered the Cossacks' traditional way of life. Since their establishment on the lower Don, the Cossacks had provided for their needs by raiding neighbouring territories. Consequently, they were perceived as a nuisance by their Muslim neighbours, but this hostility does not need to be depicted in purely religious terms. In result of the first formal peace treaty between Istanbul and Moscow (1681–2), followed by new treaties and border demarcations after each successive Russo-Ottoman war, the Cossacks felt endangered by Moscow's strict prohibitions of further raiding the Muslim territories, measures limiting their traditional herding and fishing rights, and garrisoning their lands with regular Russian soldiers.

In result, a number of 'nonconformists'⁶ among the Don Cossacks chose to shift their allegiance in order to preserve their traditional way of life. Notwithstanding their initial reluctance to extend their patronage onto the Cossacks, the Crimean khans finally conceded and in return gained valuable supporters against both Russian troops and domestic opposition. A similar policy was adopted by the Ottoman sultans, whose position on the northern Black Sea shore was endangered by the advance of Russia. In fact, this policy was not as unprecedented as it might appear. Since the mid-seventeenth century, Bakchisaray and Istanbul not once extended their patronage over the Ukrainian Cossacks, even though they had also been earlier perceived as the Muslims' mortal enemies.⁷ It is curious that precisely in the same period, the khans and the sultans faced constant opposition of their own Muslim subjects, the Nogays, who finally chose to side with Russia and in 1770 declared 'independence' under the patronage of the Russian empress.

⁶ The author himself refers to them as *kozaki-nonkonformisty*; see p. 99.

⁷ Cf. Dariusz Kolodziejczyk, 'Tertium non datur? Turets'ka al'ternatyva v zovni-shniï politytsi kozats'koï derzhavy', in Pavlo Sokhan' (ed.), *Gadyats'ka uniya 1658 roku: istoricheskaya literatura* (Kiev, 2008), 67–80.

Sen' proposes to view these events within the theoretical framework of frontier studies, once inspired by Frederick Jackson Turner and further developed especially in American historiography. Living in similar ecological conditions of the Black Sea steppe shores, the Cossacks, Tatars and Nogays adopted similar modes of life and mutual borrowing became commonplace. Facing destruction of their traditional ways of life in result of the process of the 'frontier closure', accelerating since the late seventeenth century on, local communities adopted similar pragmatic strategies. Shifting political allegiance between different rulers, or even entering the patronage of an 'infidel' monarch, was perceived in this milieu with greater ease than in the more settled societies, and certainly with a greater understanding than in the later era of nationalism, where such moves performed by either groups or individuals would be branded as 'national treason'.

It is regretful that the author does not directly refer to either William McNeill or Michael Khodarkovsky, in whose footprints he steps, even if he does so unconsciously.⁸ In fact, by invoking their studies he would strengthen some of his arguments and provide a broader theoretical as well as geographical framework for his own study. Nevertheless, both the archival and the published material used in his book is impressive. Dmitriï Sen' is to be congratulated on finding new interesting sources and stirring a provoking discussion, which can be equally useful if applied to perennial debates of Ukrainian and Polish historians regarding the ethno-religious identity and political consciousness of Zaporozhian Cossacks in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Dariusz Kotodziejczyk

⁸ Cf. William McNeill, *Europe's Steppe Frontier 1500–1800* (Chicago, 1964), and Michael Khodarkovsky, *Russia's Steppe Frontier: The Making of a Colonial Empire, 1500–1800* (Bloomington and Indianapolis, 2002); for a recent Polish translation of the latter book, see *idem*, *Na granicach Rosji. Budowanie imperium na stepie, 1500–1800* (Warsaw, 2009).

Jacek Burdowicz-Nowicki, *Piotr I, August II i Rzeczpospolita. 1697–1706* [Peter I, Augustus II and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. 1697–1706], Kraków, 2010, Wydawnictwo "Arcana", 767 pp., bibliog., index, series: Arkana Historii

The book introduces a new perspective on the first years of Augustus II's rule in Poland, from efforts made over election through to abdication in Altranstädt. It is chiefly an analysis of activities conducted in the silence of diplomatic chambers; military questions are raised when they become of importance for

explaining the former. The author has brought in to the academic domain new sources – first and foremost Russian archives, previously inaccessible, though also recourse is made to Prussian and Saxon sources. An impressive number of printed sources (Russian, German, Swedish, Italian), ones often forgotten and insufficiently taken into consideration by predecessors or ones simply mistakenly interpreted (for example due to no understanding of context), have been referred to. These include an outstanding and numerous group of old prints. The great value of the book lies in the critical appraisals of the multilingual literature on the subject, particularly the Swedish historiography, something poorly known within a Polish context.

Burdowicz-Nowicki discusses the individual problems from the perspective of Peter I's and Augustus II's political aims. He starts from an analysis of Russian foreign policy in relation to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth at the beginning of the personal government of the tsar (therefore still during the lifetime of John Sobieski). He analyses the causes of Russian passivity during the interregnum period of 1696–7, and subsequently its sudden activity following the split election. Attention is drawn to the particular role concluded at Rawa Ruska of a 'personal alliance' between Augustus II and Peter I. He discusses the negotiations regarding Russian military intervention in Poland and the support of Wettin's struggle for the throne, the relations of both monarchs to the Turkish war (1698–1700), the preparations for war with Sweden and the individual stages in the creation of an anti-Swedish alliance (to which the greatest quantity of the work is devoted). A discussion with the findings of predecessors is undertaken in those areas like the absolutist and dynastic plans of Wettin, the problem of alleged Lithuanian separatism, the influence of the Livonian Johann Reinhold Patkul on Peter I's political concepts or – of the more minor issues – the embarrassing joint counterfeiting of Polish money by Wettin and Romanov. A sizeable part of the work is taken up with analysis of the tsar's and king's measures to draw the Commonwealth into the war with Charles XII. The author attempts to define the Commonwealth's place within the political calculations of Peter I. He arrives at the genesis of Poland's treatment as a Russian buffer state and 'wayside inn', to the beginnings of 'negative Polish policy' and the ideas of a Russian guarantee for the permanence of the Polish political system. The author draws one's attention to the broadly expressed international context. Burdowicz-Nowicki considers the influence of Russia's priority tasks in Poland on the relations of the tsarist state with Sweden, Austria, Prussia, though equally with France and England. He also deals with the question of the Prussian, Russian and Swedish annexation and partition plans as well as Augustus II's ambiguous relation to them – problems repeatedly referred to, most often, however, without an in-depth analysis of the sources and works.

The work's chief asset is the revealing of the origins of the loss of subjectivity and sovereignty on the part of the Commonwealth as well as the

country's gradual slide into Russian influence. The author reveals the prioritised significance of relations with Peter I within Augustus II's policy and the significant role of the king himself, who in acting *per fas et nefas* and contrary to traditional Polish political preferences, more than once crossed that thin line demarcating insufficient consideration for Polish national interest and high treason itself. It was Augustus II who opened up to Russian diplomacy Polish internal policy. Burdowicz-Nowicki dispels the myths connected with the so-called 'Lithuanian separatism', showing that many times it was the king who stimulated cooperation between the Lithuanian republicans and Moscow, in order, via their intermediacy, to draw the Commonwealth into the Swedish War. He presents the play with the abdication argument, disloyalty against Poles (e.g. the disclosure to the Russians of the Polish envoy's instructions prior to the negotiations at Narva in 1704), placing dynastic or Saxon interests above those of the Commonwealth itself. Based on diplomatic material there is also an attempt to find the relationship of Polish magnates to the policy of the king and tsar along with the origins of the so-called 'Russian party' in Poland.

We see Augustus II as a ruler torn between dreams of grandeur and political realities, as a selfish man, showing no consideration for anything or anybody, cynical, two-faced and disloyal not only to the state, whose crown he wore, but also in relation to his immediate collaborators. We may see the scale of Augustus II's dependency on Peter I in a new light, although I would find the thesis that it acquired a vassal relationship framework debateable. Burdowicz-Nowicki's work allows us to understand better the sources of specific and lasting mistrust on the part of the Polish society of Augustus II – one of the reasons for the defeat of later king's attempts to free himself from Russian influences.

Of interest is the new view of Peter I, whose personage has been many times mythologised by researchers. The author attempts not to demonise the tsar's influence on Polish affairs. He presents this undoubtedly exceptional ruler as a man merely learning at this time the art of government, one developing his political plans and – quite understandably – one making mistakes. During the process of Russia growing from a marginal state to that of one of the top European powers he demonstrates the role of the Commonwealth as a 'transmission belt' of Russian influences from the east to the west. He proves that relations with the Commonwealth were of priority significance for the tsar. The process of learning by Russian politicians of the modern techniques of diplomatic work and of the skilful playing off of the differences between Poles and their ruler are presented. Of great value is the new interpretation of the known – so it had appeared – negotiations of Tomasz Działyński in 1704 at Narva. The negotiations are chiefly described from a Russian perspective. We see how the tsar, guarding himself against the departure of Wettin, led to the 'binding' of the Commonwealth by the Treaty

of Narva. In this way he guaranteed for himself Polish 'passive sabotage', the 'sinking' of Charles XII in the Commonwealth which gave him time to prepare for battle over the Russian window on Europe on the Baltic. Burdowicz-Nowicki convincingly sets forth how the tsar, in making use of the fact of alliance for his own political and propaganda aims as well as thanks to unfulfilled subsidised commitments, prevented the Commonwealth from strengthening its armed forces in a way dangerous for him. Russian treaty commitments were signed with the intention of not being honoured and the application of the argument of force in dealings with the Commonwealth. At least in a part this anti-Polish strategy was – as is convincingly presented by the author – agreed with Wettin. A significant achievement is also the presentation of the role played by Russia in stimulating the creation of the pro-Augustan Sandomierz Confederation.

This fascinating picture of the first years of Polish-Saxon union is, however, extremely pessimistic and is significantly removed from the attempts that have been undertaken in recent years to place the practices of Augustus II within the ground of *Realpolitik*. The analysis conducted is in a precise language, one devoid of simplifications. Burdowicz-Nowicki weighs up his evaluations, modulating the motivations of his heroes. He does not hide his doubts while unproven hypotheses he does not recognise as theses. His polemical nerve is clearly also visible, his critical relation to known authorities, though also an appreciation of the achievements (sometimes of those forgotten) of earlier historiography. A significant proportion of the footnotes is involved in a piercing polemic with the authors of spectacular though insufficiently grounded statements, in many places restoring ranking to the findings of nineteenth and early twentieth century historiography.

Given the dimension of the work the author was unable to avoid repetition, constructional shortcomings (e.g., certain problem areas have been chronologically moved forward in a noticeable way in order for them to subsequently retract with the narration). The proof-reader has not always managed to pick up on punctuation and stylistic mistakes. The said faults are, however, marginal when compared to the fact that we have received an important original work into the first years of Polish-Saxon union. This book is one whose findings cannot be overlooked by any researcher into the political history of Poland, Russia and neighbouring countries at the turn of the eighteenth century (and not only).

trans. Guy Torr

Urszula Kosińska

Grzegorz Krzywiec, *Szowinizm po polsku. Przypadek Romana Dmowskiego (1886–1905)* [A Polish Chauvinism: The Case of Roman Dmowski (1886–1905)], Warszawa, 2009, Wydawnictwo Neriton, Instytut Historii PAN, 500 pp., bibliog., indexes

This extensive work by Grzegorz Krzywiec is without doubt one of the most fiercely discussed books in recent years. It drew a critical acclaim manifested in the presentation of a number of awards (including the most important award for a historical book on the Polish market, the Historical Book Publishers' Klio Prize). It has equally not been spared criticism not only within academic journals but in the right-wing Polish press and within Internet portals. For certain this heated interest is not a result of the publication format. Weighed down with its enormous quantity of footnotes, imbued with a most detailed analysis of obscure and little known texts, the book, although written in an accessible style and with a healthy dose of irony, is a *stricte* academic work to its core. It is the subject matter that has roused the readers' interest. It seems that the young Roman Dmowski (Krzywiec concludes the narrative in 1905, when the nationalist leader had barely entered his forties, and still had a reasonable amount to go to the height of his political career) is still a figure of interest not only to historians but one who arouses public debate. Fuel for such a lively reaction is above all provided by the way in which the author has treated his hero – an approach that though in line with that dominating within world historiography, is one that in relation to this question in Polish history, as it would appear, arouses controversies.

The work comprises an introduction, six chapters and a conclusion. The starting point is the activity of the self-learning circles amongst Polish pupils of schools within the Russian area of partition and the active role played in them by Roman Dmowski. From youthful revolt the author moves on to sketching the ideological changes within the Polish intelligentsia of the 1880s and 1890s. At the centre of interest is the periodical *Głos* [The Voice], grouping around itself individuals of radical views, although not necessarily as yet nationalistic. The undertaking by Dmowski of cooperation with *Głos* coincided with an accelerated ideological evolution of the periodical. His publicist activities of this period bear witness to a good knowledge of the ideas of social Darwinism and 'scientific' racism that were developing at this time in Europe. This latter phenomenon is the subject of the third chapter. It is at the same time one of the most penetrating yet concise presentations of the history of racist ideas in Poland. Starting from the first indigenous propagators, Krzywiec devotes a lot of room to an analysis of the series of articles 'Czem jest Izrael?' [What is Israel?], published in *Głos* in 1890. On the basis of an analysis of the views of the book's protagonist with those presented in the article under the name of Witold Ziemiński, Krzywiec links

the personages of Ziemiński and Dmowski in one. This unusually radical for the time manifestation of anti-Semitism turned out to be finally too brutal for it to dominate the world view of the *Głos* circle. Its theses, however, were to return in later years in Dmowski's publicist works and were to finally end up within the ideological arsenal of Polish anti-Semitism.

In the subsequent, fourth chapter, Krzywiec analyses the views of Dmowski and his contemporaries on the state of western civilisation as well as the need, derived from their pessimistic conclusions, for exceptional leadership individuals, ones capable of shaping the crowd into politically organised masses. Equally the evolution of Dmowski's views in this question is placed against a wider European background. The next element in the outlook of the future leader of national democracy was to be formed under the influence of the failures in the student demonstrations directed against Russia that took place in Congress Poland. This movement, described in the fifth chapter, was to be for many participants the experience of a generation. It equally was to influence the polarisation of political attitudes amongst Polish radicals. In accordance with the views articulated already in earlier texts by Dmowski, the weight of the movement's programme moved from the struggle for independence waged against Russia to the battle with the 'internal enemy' – whether this be socialists or Jews.

The last two chapters take up over a half of the book and are devoted the most to its protagonist. Krzywiec follows the individual motifs within Dmowski's world outlook, he analyses his reading materials and the models of political culture he derived from abroad, for example from the chauvinist British populist, in his time mayor of Birmingham, Joseph Chamberlain. Here he also raises the question of the relationship of the leader of the National League towards parliamentary democracy. A separate subchapter deals with Dmowski's relations towards Jews. Krzywiec shows in a convincing way that racism expressing itself in radicalised anti-Semitism 'became one of the key bonds in outlook within this version of nationalism that he propagated' (p. 249). An important subject in this part of the book is also the political tactics of the national democrat leader, ones exceptionally modern in many aspects. The author goes deeper into the organisational problems of the Polish nationalist movement, showing the mechanism for taking control over social, cultural and political organisations. He also traces the press campaigns conducted with relish by the national democratic press directed against ideological opponents. A brutalisation in language and behaviour accompanied these phenomena played out within the Austrian partition and therefore in conditions allowing for free political rivalry. Equally in this respect Dmowski was a leader and model for his circles. There occurred simultaneously a drawing closer of nationalists with conservative circles and the attempts to gain the electoral votes of the peasantry. The programme advanced by Dmowski and accepted by the Polish nationalist movement was

based, as Krzywiec writes, on the three myths: of 'the new man', of (national) empire and the most expressive myth of the enemy – the Jew (p. 397).

The book's construction is, as I have mentioned, in accordance with the presently popular broad understanding of a historical biography. The hero's life serves as the axis of the exposition, yet within it much wider matters are considered. At the factual level the author describes a cultural generation searching for generational experiences and the styles of thought and political action characteristic for the period. On the ideological plane he bases himself not only on an analysis of the hero's works, but reaches out for a wider context. In the case of Grzegorz Krzywiec's book, the Polish context which has drawn the attention of earlier researchers into the subject is accompanied by a serious treatment of the international background. This international backcloth comprises two components: reference to Western European concepts, whose reception in general raises no doubts (for Dmowski noted down in correspondence or reviewed particular positions, e.g., those of the French ethnopsychologists Alfred Fouillée and Jean-Marie Guyau) as well as a comparative examination of analogical phenomena in East-Central Europe, first and foremost in the Austro-Hungarian Empire and in Romania. It follows to say that it is just these fragments, which serve to place Dmowski against the wider background of a radical generation, are amongst the most interesting parts of the book. Here one can see the depth and breadth of research, a good knowledge of the realities of the day as well as the workings of an inquiring mind.

The approach adopted by Krzywiec is the result of a conscious selection of an appropriate methodology. This is borne out by the clear reference to chiefly the Anglo-Saxon tradition of research into sources of fascist ideologies and cultural pessimism of the turn of centuries. References to Polish literature on the subject is admittedly sizeable, but the author draws his inspiration from elsewhere. Key to an understanding of this approach to the political ideology and style of action of Roman Dmowski is the concept of 'politics in a new key' borrowed from Carl E. Schorske, imposing to some extent a comparison of the leader of National Democracy (ND) with the leaders of similar groupings – e.g., Georg Schönerer and Karl Lueger. One may also notice a link in Krzywiec's work with those of Maciej Janowski, ones arising earlier, who concluded his history of Polish liberalism at the moment from which Krzywiec begins his story.¹ As Janowski writes, the crisis of liberalism in the quarter of a century preceding the First World War did not result from

¹ Maciej Janowski, *Polska myśl liberalna do 1918 roku* (Cracow, 1998); *idem*, *Polish Liberal Thought before 1918* (Budapest and New York, 2004); *idem*, *Inteligencja wobec wyzwań nowoczesności. Dylematy ideowe polskiej demokracji liberalnej w Galicji w latach 1889–1914* (Warsaw, 1994).

the appearance of some rational arguments which would have brought into question the liberal vision of the world. The spiritual atmosphere of the epoch changed, rationalism went out of fashion; heroic virtues again appeared to be more important than 'small virtues'.²

Krzywiec analyses the greatest ideological calling imposed on Polish liberalism – first and foremost by Roman Dmowski, the creator of the Polish variety of nationalism, one closely connected with racism.

The most interesting motifs sketched by the author surely include the situating of Dmowski within the context of the ideological debates and cultural phenomena of the entire European continent. Here is, e.g., the motif of aesthetic repulsion for Jews, finding analogy in phenomena contemporary to Dmowski including those in the Reich and Austria (to recall the ideas of the Viennese publicist Jörg Lanz von Liebenfels). Aesthetic repulsion was connected first and foremost in all these cases with the conviction as to the moral fall of the 'Jewish race'. A novelty in the Polish subject literature is the highlighting of the biologism of the views of nationalist leaders. Krzywiec instils a new meaning into a fact known, if not widely then mentioned in all the biographies of Dmowski written to date. This biologist by education had earlier come into contact with anthropological racism, as well as with new currents in psychology and sociology. The social Darwinism of Dmowski was based on the solid foundations of biological knowledge. He was fascinated by Le Bon, considering race as a factor deciding on the history of nations and states, a natural factor in its nature. In a way similar to many other contemporary nationalists, he was fascinated by the idea of 'purity of blood'. In his case the reception granted to Western European currents was for certain not the mindless repetition of populist slogans. All the more the case, as Krzywiec proves, given that Dmowski did not adopt in his utterances on the Jewish question a particularist position. It is characteristic that at a later period he joined in the global anti-Semitic campaign financed by Henry Ford. He considered the Jewish problem to not only concern Poland but the whole of Europe and as a European he sought a solution to it.

The next phenomenon, which thanks to the perspective adopted in the book becomes much clearer, is the already mentioned new style of conducting politics. The 'mass nature' of it does not cover the entirety of its features. An equally important phenomenon was its brutalisation. A good example of which, treated within the book with sensitivity and tact, was Dmowski's attitude to the Jewish supporters of National Democracy, being living proof contradicting his biological theses. A symbolic moment in the history of the attitudes of National Democracy to the Jews is seen by Krzywiec at

² Janowski, *Polska myśl*, 274.

the moment of the ceremonial funeral of a loyal activist of the National League, Bolesław Hirszfeld, who dies by suicide. In the sphere of political tactics it is worth drawing attention to the notorious symbolic utterance, for the ND press, given in the name of the entire Polish nation as well as the exclusion of political opponents from the circle of being 'true' Poles. Finally, he draws attention to the mechanisms for the creation of a socio-political environment linked with the National League. The instrument was not only organisational work, but also the fast and efficient organisation of rallies, marches, ceremonies and public lectures. There existed houses around which movement activists and sympathisers concentrated. In writing about the social solidarism of National Democracy, Krzywiec claims that the ideological charge of the Polish movement was richer and more complicated than the primitive xenophobia of the activists of the German Eastern Marches Society (*Deutscher Ostmarkenverein*) (p. 212). This thesis is valid, though it omits an important aspect of the German nationalist movement. For this was, in a similar way the environment concentrated around Roman Dmowski, a numerous and heterogeneous assembly of supporters and advocates of the most diverse forms of nationalist ideology, including those with elements of occultism. The structures whose origins are described in the book are therefore evidence of the reception for international ideological currents in degree no less than the political or cultural views of Dmowski.

In Roman Dmowski's biologicistic outlook the most important role was played by the Jews. The author, in analysing the papers of the national democrats leader, persuades one that in this very question his programme had developed much earlier, while later it was to be consistently put into practice. One may say that racism in this Polish guise was from the very start concentrated on the Jews and that it was in this 'internal enemy' that it saw its main opponent; one even more threatening than the partitioning powers. As often is the case in group heterostereotypes this image of the enemy so completely exhausted the inventiveness of the ideologist of nationalism that his projects for 'positive' solutions to the Jewish question come out fairly weakly. For certain Dmowski did not consider assimilation to be such a solution. In refuting the Polishness of assimilated Jews he referred to the convictions as to the unchangeable 'spirit of a race'. The conspiratorial vision of the world included the mutually validating theorems: the task of Polish nationalism was the elimination of 'destructive elements', while Jews stood behind all the harmful phenomena of modern civilisation. They were to strive to build on the Polish lands Judeo-Polonia, in which Dmowski sought to uncover Russia's secret plan. The only possible solution for adherents of such views was simply the disappearance of the Jews. The author identifies this set of convictions with eliminationist anti-Semitism.

It seems that it is the question of Dmowski's anti-Semitism that constitutes the point at which Krzywiec's work most noticeably departs from

hitherto Polish (for not necessarily international)³ understandings of the subject. This does not mean that earlier Polish historiography refuted the fact that Dmowski was an anti-Semite. His very own declarations would have made this difficult. Rather the case in point is that, like in the widely-read biography by Roman Wapiński,⁴ his earlier anti-Semitic tirades were rationalised, with admittance that toward the end of his life he had fallen into an obsession with the Jewish question.⁵ While Krzywiec shows that racist eliminationist anti-Semitism in its absolute fundamentals had formed itself already in an earlier phase of Dmowski's political and publicist activities. And it was the axis around which the leader of the national democrats was to add the other elements of his programme. In the introduction the author criticises the dominating division within Polish literature into two Dmowskis:

The 'first' Dmowski crowns his life with the signing of the Treaty of Versailles. He is the joint creator (although somewhat embarrassingly mentioned as a result of later developments) of independence. The 'second' Dmowski is the extreme nationalist politician, the propagator of radical anti-Semitism, with it a skilful demagogue, one overwhelmed in his dotage by murderous phobias (p. 20).

Dmowski's anti-Semitic obsession appeared already at secondary school, as Krzywiec notes, in a manner that was not totally understood by even his friends. He turned out to be of sufficiently strong a personality that he was ultimately able to impose his views and phobias onto a whole political movement. Krzywiec underlines several times this precursory (and radicalising) role of Dmowski. In searching for the sources of his world view he does not, thankfully, concentrate solely on the influence of his family home, noting only succinctly the anti-Semitic attitudes of the politician's mother. He ascribes greater significance to social Darwinism for this ideological inspiration. The politician's obsessions in this optic are not an anomaly but precisely the manifestation of modernity.

The second place in which Krzywiec's interpretation goes beyond the already well trodden track is the problem of Dmowski's attitude to democracy. Equally here, in approaching the matter from the premise of the ND leader's ideological integrality, it did not constitute for him an independent value. The aim for which Dmowski strove was national civilisation, a racial community without 'others'. This was a position unique

³ Cf. Brian Porter, *When Nationalism Began to Hate. Imagining Modern Politics in Nineteenth-century Poland* (New York, 2000).

⁴ Roman Wapiński, *Roman Dmowski* (Lublin, 1988, 2nd edn – 1989).

⁵ *Ibidem*, 200–3.

in Polish conditions, nevertheless in the context of the ideological borrowings traced in the book it finds its place within the framework of general European phenomena.

*

The book by Krzywiec has witnessed, in the course of the two years since publication, numerous reactions to its content, of which only a few are worthy of reference.⁶ I have left to the side certain press and Internet utterances and outbursts, as well as interviews with historians who criticised the author for ideological reasons. Those left after this selection are instructive reads, even if they talk more about the state of Polish historiography and public debate than they do about the book itself. It is with a great sense of satisfaction that one notes that such an academic work on a fairly, it would have seemed, distant subject should have drawn the attention of not only the specialist reader. To comment on or polemicise with individual theses is obviously not the task of a reviewer. I would, however, like to draw attention to several characterising and repeating moments as well as one, fairly disturbing (one supposes) tendency present in almost every utterance on the subject of the book in question.

In reading the reviews on the work it is easy to draw the conclusion that the fundamental question asked by their authors is: Does Grzegorz Krzywiec like or not like Roman Dmowski? Common to all, regardless of the tone of the review, is the negative reply to the question in hand. The authors engaged in polemics with Krzywiec's position claim that, despite his opinion on Dmowski, the nationalist leader was a broad based democrat, a man much less anti-Semitic than results from reading the book and, first and foremost, someone who fought for an independent Poland. His attitude to Jews was not to be any more negative in tone than that held in relation to Russians (in what way this last argument was meant to improve the image of the leader of National Democracy is not entirely clear). Within this context it is worth noting the penetrative force of the reviewers, who literally control the pertinence and precision of the numerous quotes, as well as even the references to the works cited. Given the solidity of the work this process does not result in compromising revelations but chiefly in accusations of the exaggeration, radicalisation or inappropriate placing of emphasis within the interpretation of particular statements made by Dmowski.

⁶ I refer to the following reviews and articles: Krzysztof Kawalec, review in *Dzieje Najnowsze*, xlii, 3 (2010), 177–88; Bogumił Grott, 'Paszkwil na Dmowskiego. Z powodu książki Grzegorza Krzywca', *Glaukopis*, 19-20 (2011), pp. 331–5; Katarzyna Wrzesińska, 'O obsesjach, które można uzasadnić, czyli rasizm po polsku', *Sprawy Narodowościowe*, 37 (2010), pp. 189–95; Daria Nałęcz, 'Duch przeistoczony w upiora', *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 21 Oct. 2010.

It is worth drawing attention to the key category of racism in Krzywiec's book. Typical for the reviewers is the articulation either directly or through insinuation of an identification of this ideology with the Third Reich and the Holocaust. The comparison of Dmowski with Hitler is one that has to arouse controversy and here one should in no way be surprised that the reviewers are even shocked by such a vision. It does follow, however, to remember that they themselves have created it. They draw attention – and completely justifiably – to the ambiguity of the category of 'race' used by Dmowski's contemporaries. They do so with one and only one aim in mind, to show that its use does not necessarily have to be connected with a racist worldview. Meanwhile the comparative dimension of Krzywiec's book remains almost completely beyond their field of view. A part of the reviewers ignore it altogether, in one case it was considered to be superfluous ballast. The only context within which they are inclined to place and analyse Dmowski's views is a national, Polish context. This undertaking is not devoid of a certain irony, for there revives within it the former Marxist-Leninist dogma in which all social and cultural phenomena were to have arisen from indigenous sources, not alien, foreign ones, and certainly not Western European ones. In an evaluation of Dmowski's racism such an attitude is of real significance. For if a comparison and transfer of ideas is rejected even from those sources about which one can be certain an influence on him was exerted (such as those of Le Bon and Chamberlain) then the field for evaluating the political attitudes of the national democrats leader drastically contracts in scope. If the only racism which one is conscious of is the ideology of the Third Reich, then one actually may come to the conclusion that imputing a racist world outlook to Roman Dmowski places him in a line with Nazi criminals. However, the whole of such a construction requires one to stray beyond that which is in Grzegorz Krzywiec's book original and worthwhile.

The almost total ignoring of the comparative material assembled in the book by the hitherto published reviews is something that surprises as well as saddens. By closing one's eyes to the transfer of ideas and the parallel development in the history of countries that in more than one aspect remind one of Poland deprives the historian of effective tools allowing for a widening and fuller examination of one's own history. In the case of Roman Dmowski this self-induced limitation excludes one from perceiving the European format of this Polish politician. The theses he advanced at the beginning of the twentieth century did not belong to political folklore, but were in various hues and forms ones that appeared almost everywhere. The consistence with which Dmowski based the programme of Polish nationalism on these guarantees him a leading place in the history of the European radical right. The attention that is drawn to this fact is another of the services provided by Krzywiec's book, one, however, unfortunately ignored completely by its reviewers.

To conclude the author tackles a fundamental problem, the resolving of which extends beyond the subject of the book. In a way similar to Tomasz Kizwalter a decade earlier, he recognises the beginning of the twentieth century, symbolised by the date of publication of Roman Dmowski's *Mysli nowoczesnego Polaka* [Thoughts of a Modern Pole] (1902), as crucial for the Polish collective identity. And also like Kizwalter, he ponders on how wide-ranging the idea of combining integral nationalism with the dominating Catholicism of the Polish cultural expanse was to be.⁷ His initial diagnosis is explicit: this fusion occurred, despite the opposition inherent in each of the value systems. Catholicism did not soften in the least the exclusionist practices and racist ideas, it was not to dull its radicalism. It seems that this subject, one merely pencilled in by both historians, could constitute the starting point for discussions far more intense than those accompanying a biography of Roman Dmowski.

trans. Guy Torr

Maciej Górny

⁷ Cf. Tomasz Kizwalter, *O nowoczesności narodu. Przypadek polski* (Warsaw, 1999), 319–21.

Agnieszka Jagodzińska, *Pomiędzy. Akulturacja Żydów Warszawy w drugiej połowie XIX wieku* [In-between: The Acculturation of Warsaw Jews in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century], Wrocław, 2008, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 309 pp., series: Bibliotheca Judaica, 4

Agnieszka Jagodzińska's work is an innovative study, although it is much narrower and more modest in scope than the studies by Alina Cała and Anna Landau-Czajka, already classics in Polish publishing on the subject.¹ For it covers 'the declared and actual' forms of acculturation of Warsaw Jews into Polish culture in the second half of the nineteenth century. Although the study does not claim to describe or reconstruct these processes across the entire area of Congress Poland, and this even more the case with regard to the remaining Polish lands, its value as a work extends well beyond the narrow findings concerning Warsaw's Jews.

One should note straightaway that the author in a competent and professional manner moves around the whole 'long nineteenth century', and her

¹ Alina Cała, *Asymilacja Żydów w Królestwie Polskim (1864–1897). Postawy, konflikty, stereotypy* (Warsaw, 1989); Anna Landau-Czajka, *Syn będzie Lech... Asymilacja Żydów w Polsce międzywojennej* (Warsaw, 2006); cf. also *eadem*, 'Trudny wybór. Asymilowani Żydzi o problemie tożsamości narodowej w II Rzeczypospolitej', *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, cxii, 2 (2005), 49–72.

erudition and conscientiousness in historical reconstruction are extraordinary. The work is based on broad, intense as well as – and here it is constantly worth reiterating – multilingual research conducted in numerous Polish and international centres (including ones in Israel, Great Britain, the United States) but it first and foremost constitutes an original and in many respects precursory study from an interchange of several fields: the history of ideas, social history and cultural anthropology.

The starting point, the axis that constructs and orders the whole thesis, is for the author the discussion that hinges around two phenomena of a socio-cultural character. These were, on the one hand, acculturation, i.e. the process of the cultural adaptation of a minority group to the majority society in which it lives, the adoption by it of the majority's customs and cultural models, and on the other integration, that is the process of reducing the barriers and social differences dividing groups, the height of which would be the elimination of all barriers bringing about separation (p. 11).

This approach in research into Polish Jewish society, to a dominating degree that of a traditional grouping, appears to be more promising than concentrating the attention of the research on assimilation, or maybe – as the author specifies in quoting Ezra Mendelsohn – the integration of Polish Jews. Leaving aside the long debate which accompanies this last concept, and of which Jagodzińska gives an account in the introduction, the processes for such a comprehensive integration within the Polish lands were limited in scope, although it would be difficult to overestimate their influence on the history of Polish Jewry. As oppose to assimilation, during which, as someone once aptly wrote, a part of identity remains permanently 'beyond the threshold', acculturation seems to be a far more obscure question and one more difficult to conceptualise, but also, let us add, one leaving a lot more possibilities for interpretation. And therefore it is worth noting that the author's precise and clear reasoning, free from academic jargon given the difficulty of the matter, has allowed her to avoid a series of definitional traps. This being all the more the case given that Jagodzińska devotes the majority of her considerations to the erratic identity as viewed from a nineteenth- and twentieth-century perspective of understanding nation. Her research covers, as she herself writes, considerations into acculturation 'from aesthetical changes to ones of identity' (p. 17).

A reading of the work makes one aware that nineteenth-century and later concepts of modernisation, nation and nationality attempted to force complex and dynamic collective identities into rigid identification framework. This thinking, with its roots in the French Revolution and the Enlightenment, and presumably even earlier, was unable to cope with Jewish identity. The whole end of the nineteenth century was crudely a series of attempts to find the contrasting essences of 'Polishness' and 'Jewishness'. Even the religious conversion of Jews did not level barrier, which for the non-Jewish majority

was their ethnicity. As it seems Jagodzińska has developed more precise instruments to measure up to these problems.

Her study constitutes a competently conducted and unusually inspirational attempt at translating the modern approach of the social sciences, first and foremost cultural anthropology, to the dense material of the social-cultural changes amongst Polish Jews of the nineteenth century and may constitute an important starting point and inspiration for further research into this group. The monograph, as has already been mentioned, is *de facto* a work assembled from several fields of knowledge. First and foremost it is a penetrating study in the history of ideas and social history, in which particularly the introduction and the first chapter are worthy of attention on all accounts. In the remaining parts of the work the author undertakes an attempt at formulating those phenomena and processes of interest to her within the frameworks and categories of cultural anthropology (with references to Clifford Geertz at the fore) as well as the sociology of culture.

The second chapter is devoted to the changes which the costume and appearance of Warsaw Jews underwent, chapter three – their multilingualism, wherein the author adds Esperanto to the classic set of Jewish languages and Polish, while the fourth – to onomastics, i.e. the cultural meaning of first names and surnames. The reader will also find extensive parts devoted to the group referred to as ‘Poles of Israelite denomination’. They are of the most astute, comprehensive and originally formulated within the subject literature, and yet a lot about this grouping has already been written. Today it is known how much Polish culture owes to this crisscrossing of cultures, to this being ‘in-between’.

In other words the author has given the floor to various sources and in referring to various methodological devices has presented them with new questions. She has also recalled a series of forgotten ones, though ones still important.

A certain fragmentariness and curtness in deduction may be observed in the analysis of anti-Semitic rhetoric, as in the discussion into the question of anti-Semitism in the Polish lands. These are not key questions for this work and yet it is difficult, given such a subject matter, to disregard them. Would, for example, Jagodzińska agree with Helena Datner, that already in the mid-nineteenth century there existed within the Polish lands an anti-Semitic communication community?² Or whether she also considers that it developed later, for example, only after 1905?

What is important, however, is that the author does not shun discussion, does not avoid also issues sensitive and overgrown by mythology, she is able to fluently enter into a polemic and debate with well established common estimations. That said she does not repudiate the achievements of

² Cf. Helena Datner, *Ta i tamta strona. Żydowska inteligencja Warszawy drugiej połowy XIX w.* (Warsaw, 2007), in particular pp. 265–89.

her predecessors. In a critical way she is able to converse with earlier works on the subject; this usually with interesting results, ones often contradicting colloquially held notions.

The young historian does not bombard the reader with unnecessary information, as is unfortunately often the case with debut texts, rather she supplies it in sensible manageable portions, commented on it in an intriguing way.

In summing up, this is an innovative work contributing stimulatingly new concepts, with a precisely defined leading idea, and creatively taking into consideration other methods than those most often applied in the domain of research. Jagodzińska's work is therefore a significant example of a comprehensive general humanistic monograph. This is another product of the so-called Wrocław school of Jewish Studies, and more exactly that encompassing the Centre for the Culture and Languages of the Jews at Wrocław University, one of the most thriving Polish centres for studies into Jewish history, which has been dynamically headed for a time now by Marcin Wodziński. Here it is worth noting the collective output of the unit, for it surely is going to surprise us more than once with its original approach to research into Polish Jewry.

Jagodzińska's work should be read and confronted with the more sociologically and demographically prepared work of Helena Datner, with the classic studies of Alina Cała or the works of François Guesnet or Stephen D. Corrsin,³ which are known to a small circle of specialists, though it must be pointed out that the findings of all of these works are rather complimentary and enriching than contradictory in nature. Possibly this placement within the contemporary subject literature, in consonance with the most widely discussed currents within research, is one of the most important points in the reviewed work's favour. In noting the literary charm of the work along with the conscientiousness and care taken in the research, its analytical and heuristic values it also follows to emphasise that the work goes beyond the scope of works into Jewish studies in its narrow understanding. It provides one with a range of inspiring observations and reflections on tied Polish-Jewish relations, on the processes of adaptation and socialisation of Jewish people, as well as on the nineteenth century as played out in the Polish lands. This is a study of value to not only historians of the epoch and researchers into Polish-Jewish relations, for whom it will surely constitute an essential work.

Although it was awarded a special prize at the Poznań Academic Book Days (2009) as well as being singled out as a doctoral thesis by the National Centre for Culture (2007), the monograph has come into being without much fanfare. For the one penning these lines this is, unfortunately, another proof

³ François Guesnet, *Polnische Juden im 19. Jahrhundert. Lebensbedingungen, Rechtsnormen und Organisationen im Wandel* (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna, 2001); Stephen D. Corrsin, *Warsaw before the First World War: Poles and Jews in the Third City of the Russian Empire, 1880–1914* (Boulder, 1989).

that historical debate is dominated by controversial subjects, points of view often based on a *pseudo*-positivist, so as not to say crude, methodology with a similarly explicit message. For several years the predominance is here led by publishers endorsed by the Institute of National Remembrance, the largest producer of historical writings in Poland. At a time when deep and innovative studies wander around library shelves and remain without influence on the level of the general humanistic debate being conducted within the public sphere. It is good to know that there exists an alternative to this dominating and increasingly developing current.

trans. Guy Torr

Grzegorz Krzywiec

Jerzy Kochanowski, *Tylnymi drzwiami. "Czarny rynek" w Polsce 1944–1989* [Through the Backdoor. 'The Black Market' in Poland 1944–1989], Warszawa, 2010, Wydawnictwo Neriton, Instytut Historyczny Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 386 pp.

The aim of Jerzy Kochanowski is 'a possibly interdisciplinary (though with the emphasis on the historical) reconstruction of various forms of behaviour, mechanisms, phenomena, practices, processes and strategies joined by a common black market denominator' (p. 9). Such a depiction of the title phenomenon is by all means a positive one, particularly given the terminological difficulties which occur in any attempt at its academic specification. This the author is aware of. In critically analysing the writings on the subject in various countries he claims that the one which fits best in defining the phenomena to Eastern European realities is that which has arisen on the basis of research conducted by Indian economists. In describing their native reality, they have claimed that

when the result of (effective) manipulation of supply and demand, money and/or production, trade and/or industry leads to an artificial situation of shortages (or surplus), and if in the process of turnover we maintain a huge profit scale ... then we are dealing with a black market situation (p. 21).

Being, however, aware of the far reaching conventional character of these definitions the author has consciously placed the black market of the title into inverted commas, which allows for a certain arbitrariness in the determination of what to include within this category and what to exclude.

The book's composition is highly interesting. The first chapter ['Several terminological and methodological remarks'] contains – besides the above mentioned definitional remarks – a competent overview of the typology of markets (legal, semi-legal, illegal) and an attempt at placing against this

background the phenomena which constitute the main subject of the monograph. The second chapter, which is also of a propaedeutic character, contains a short description of the black market in the first half of the twentieth century chiefly based on Western studies into the matter.

Kochanowski analyses, among other things, the dynamics of profiteering and the struggle against it in post-war Poland (Chapter 3) and the geographic differentiation of the 'black market': the opposition of the centre – periphery, north – south, west – east Poland (Chapter 4). The problem axis of the subsequent chapters are: meat (Chapter 5), alcohol (6), petrol (7), dollars and gold (8) as well as the tourist movement in the Polish People's Republic (PRL) (9). The measures focused on them led to activity most frequently classified by the authorities as speculation, and it was they that were to dominate black market everydayness.

One of the most important pluses of the monograph under review is its source base. This consists of an imposing set of archive funds which have undergone scrupulous research. What is important is that the sets are assembled not only in central archives (first and foremost the Central Archives of Modern Records in Warsaw, but also in the Archives of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Centre for Polish State Television Documentation and Programme Collections, the Trade Unions Archive, the Institute of National Remembrance), as equally regional collections (in Gdynia, Gorzów Wielkopolski, Cracow, Wrocław). In addition the author has assembled several accounts on the subject of the black market. It is difficult to formulate any serious objections with regard to such a broad collection of archival sources. My own experience shows that research conducted at the Departmental Archive of the Supreme Audit Office (AZNIK) would have enriched the conclusions contained in the work, because the Supreme Audit Office (NIK; and Ministry for State Control) collection used by the author does not contain many of the post-inspection findings, especially from the 1980s, valuable in relation to the perspective of the work. Also of interest would have been an acquaintance with the AZNIK reports from inspections carried out by the Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate.

Without doubt another significant merit of the work is the admirable ability to utilise the press of the PRL period. One may talk about a revalorisation of press journalism, particularly visible in the parts of the monograph relating to the 1970s and 1980s. The author has uncovered not only texts of interest to him in the generally accessible and popular weeklies and dailies (*Polityka* [Politics], *Perspektywy* [Perspectives], *Kultura* [Culture], *Trybuna Ludu* [The People's Tribune]), but also in the 'niche' press, most important for the matters under consideration (*Wiadomości Celne* [Customs News], *Zagadnienia Wykroczeń* [Misdemeanour Issues]). The fruitfulness of the press research results from two fundamental reasons. Firstly, despite censorial hampering, the journalism of the day wrote about many black market social

practices, which are difficult or totally impossible to decipher on the basis of a reading of official materials of a report nature. Thanks to this Kochanowski could sketch and record images of casual occurrences yet ones important for the urban landscape of the PRL (like, e.g., ‘the door-to-door veal woman’). Secondly, this censorial hampering was much less in the recalled ‘niche’ titles, issued in small prints and addressed to a narrow circle of readers.

Another plus of the utilised source base is its interdisciplinary character, forced by the nature of the work, thanks to which the Polish black market may be viewed from many research perspectives. Finally, visible is Kochanowski’s tendency to search for the historical genealogy of the phenomena described (esp. Chapter 2). But this is not the end: the detailed chapters are preceded by – out of necessity shortened – comments showing the role of these phenomena within a longer chronological perspective.

Let us move on to some detailed comments on the author’s findings.

In the second chapter he describes what he calls ‘Polish (anti)profiteering sinusoid’. Herein are contained, among other things, the characteristics of the most important institutions instigated for the inspection and regulation of the market (*Komisja Specjalna do Walki z Nadużyciami i Szkodnictwem Gospodarczym* [Special Commission for the Combating of Abuses and Economic Wrecking], 1945–54; *Zespoły do Zwalczenia Spekulacji i Nadużyć Gospodarczych* [Departments for Combating Profiteering and Economic Abuse], active from 1957 to 1961; as well as the *Centralna/Terenowa Komisja do Walki ze Spekulacją* [Central/Local Commission for Combating Profiteering], 1981–7). Kochanowski shows not only how ineffective their work was in the conditions of the original sin of a centrally planned economy – that is ones of constant shortage, but also how complicated the problem of the black market was for all manner of regulation. He substantiates how the appliance of legal norms collided with social realities. The dilemmas of this type were most glaringly shown with regard to the 1980s when many judges sought a compromise between the severity of the legal regulations penalising even the most trivial of profiteering offences, and the minute harm that these acts committed by poor people actually constituted, often pensioners and those on disability benefits having difficulty in making ends meet (p. 111). The considerations placed in this chapter probably could have been enhanced by the examples (already known from research) of ‘large scale economic scandals’ which were the realm of enquiry for the aforementioned Special Commission for the Combating of Abuses and Economic Wrecking for the period 1948–9.¹

¹ These included: the coal affair (embezzlement at the Headquarters for Coal Industry Product Sales; one of the elements in this affair was embezzlement at The Municipal Fuel Plant in Warsaw), the H-Z affair (embezzlement in the trade of sheet steel and iron), the ‘Bacutil’ affair (the selling on of fat, intestines and other animal waste products to private enterprises), embezzlement in craft supply

Chapter 4, on the geography of the black market, superbly shows its specific nature in the country's centre (Warsaw and large cities) and within the peripheries (understood as parish and district Poland), in the south (an excellent case study on Podhale, in particular Zakopane) and in the north (the port cities), on the 'eastern wall' and in the west (contacts with the GDR and not only). This part of the work answers the question as to what was the strength of small informal local groups based on, groups that often were impossible to be effectively fought as a result of the link of private initiative with the structures of power. The author, on the example of private shops which obtained licences to trade after the year 1956, shows that the shortage in the goods allocated for them was the reason their owners entered into black market deals and arrangements. The problem was much wider in scope (something understood by the author). In this context it would have been worthwhile employing the NIK analysis of 1957, which examined the acts of 18 cases of economic fraud ending at the time in indictments. It turned out that the situation in which licences for private enterprise were granted (not merely for shops) without an allocation of goods and raw materials created the then criminal mechanism.²

The chapter devoted to the role of meat in the black market is richly documented, and most interestingly presented are the various contexts connected with the lack of meat. Several of the author's findings do require, however, a certain specification or supplementation. This is, for example, the case concerning 'meatless days' which already appeared in 1946. The rigours were somewhat relaxed in 1949 but the idea of such a regulation of consumption was still in force even after the period of Stalinism. An invention on the part of Gomułka's team in this regard were the so-called 'meatless Mondays', introduced in 1959. On this day it was forbidden to serve meat dishes in restaurants and canteens, while in shops on sale was only offal, brawns, black pudding, fat bacon and lard.

From the reference to the strike in Żyrardów (p. 172) one may surmise that it was brought about by meat shortages. It appears that the reasons were more complicated; the women went on strike there also (and it cannot be excluded that first and foremost) as a result of the shortages in coal, bread and fabric (which was produced there).³

institutions, and in sawmill and wood processing plants, cf. Dariusz Jarosz and Tadeusz Wolsza, 'Komisja Specjalna do Walki z Nadużyciami i Szkodnictwem Gospodarczym (1945–1954)', *Biuletyn Głównej Komisji Badania Zbrodni przeciwko Narodowi Polskiemu*, 36 (1993), 22–3.

² See Archiwum Akt Nowych, Warsaw (hereafter: AAN), NIK, 17/57, Analiza dokumentów, dotyczących osiemnastu spraw przestępstw gospodarczych, pp. 46–54.

³ For the most interesting article on the subject see Małgorzata Fidelis, *Women, Communism, and Industrialization in Postwar Poland* (Cambridge, etc., 2010), 61–98.

One could regret that in writing about compulsory supplies (p. 174), Kochanowski did not use the results of those pieces of research that showed in what way the peasants avoided (or got round) the existing bans.⁴ It also seems that the origin of many black market practices ‘with meat in the background’ mentioned in the sections of the monograph on the 1970s and 1980s could be successfully sought in an earlier period. This concerns the referred to (p. 190) barter exchanges, where meat was the commodity or the matter concerned irregularities in the killing of slaughter animal. Both phenomena are described in relation to the characteristics of the meat industry in the 1980s, while for certain they had already appeared in the 1950s. It is also regrettable that Jerzy Kochanowski has not carried out at least a shortened profile, of the means to ‘make use of surpluses’ in shops and meat plants. His considerations on the matter of the meat industry and the excesses carried out there start from the 1980s (pp. 188 ff.). Yet we know a lot on the basis of research into earlier periods.⁵ And finally the question which is of importance to explain the conditions in which the black market sales took place: how was it possible that despite the supply difficulties in Gomułka’s Poland the authorities of the day did not decide to introduce rationing?

What appears of especial value in the next chapter (‘Alcohol’) is the illustration of the varied social conditioning in the illegal production and trade in alcohol. Kochanowski has an expert sense of the various social complications and dilemma before which the authorities found themselves in conducting their policy on alcohol. Because, e.g., the punishment for trading in moonshine could have fallen on a woman burdened by a sizeable family, who, in this way, was ‘supplementing’ her paltry pension.

In as far as the author could have elaborated his writing in earlier chapters by the results of others’ research, in the case of the analyses contained in chapters on petrol, dollars and gold, he is an unquestionable pioneer. His findings are innovative and drawn from a varied source base. The sketch to the portrait of a ‘money changer’, in a similar way to the ‘veal woman’ – is a competent, academic attempt to save from oblivion a figure which was one of the icons of the cityscape of the Polish People’s Republic.

In writing the ninth chapter (‘The tourist trade in the Polish People’s Republic’) Kochanowski was also unable to use a lot of earlier research (besides the contributions of Paweł Sowiński or Małgorzata Mazurek as well as certain western authors) for the historiographic output on this subject matter is limited. The analysis undertaken – as results from the specifics of the problem matter – uses diplomatic materials kept at the Archive of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. The author attempts to show (and manages

⁴ See, i.a., Dariusz Jarosz, *Polityka władz komunistycznych w Polsce w latach 1948–1956 a chłopi* (Warsaw, 1998), 210–14.

⁵ Dariusz Jarosz and Maria Pasztor, *Afera mięsna: fakty i konteksty* (Toruń, 2004).

this in a most interesting way) not only the ‘Polish point of view’ on the phenomenon but also that of the authorities and societies of those countries which had experienced the ‘invasions’ of the ‘Phoenicians of Eastern Europe’ – as Polish small time traders were sometimes referred to.

Finally in reviewing Kochanowski’s book one must mention the conclusions drawn at the end of the work. The author asks the fundamental question: to what extent did the black market undermine the system, or to what extent did it reinforce it? The answer is weighed and equivocal for differently it could not be. In not writing off the importance of black market practices in easing the situation of a part of Polish society within the post-1989 reality, Kochanowski claims that the black market ‘was, however, a criminalising of everydayness, a sense of becoming accustomed to law breaking, one generally considered (to be) justified’ (p. 343). These are important observations, all the more valuable that they are made in a work which has every chance of entering into the canon of reading on the social history of the Polish People’s Republic.

trans. Guy Torr

Dariusz Jarosz

Małgorzata Mazurek, *Spółeczeństwo kolejki. O doświadczeniach niedoboru 1945–1989* [The Queuing Society: About Experiences of Shortage 1945–1989], Gdańsk – Warszawa, 2010, Europejskie Centrum Solidarności, Wydawnictwo TRIO, 242 pp., series: W Krainie PRL: ludzie, sprawy, problemy: rzeczywistość PRL odczytana z akt, dokumentów, zapisów, twórczości

The author of the work belongs to a young generation of researchers involved in work into the social history of the Polish People’s Republic (PRL) and the German Democratic Republic. Her earlier work (*Socjalistyczny zakład pracy. Porównanie fabrycznej codzienności w PRL i NRD u progu lat sześćdziesiątych* [The Socialist Factory. A Comparison of Factory Everyday Life in the PRL and the GDR at the Turn of the 1960s], Warsaw, 2005) showed that we are dealing with an original and inquiring researcher.

The book under review is a compilation of five studies, the main subject matter of which is the experience of shopping in the reality of the PRL. This refers to ‘a certain extract of social reality which people – in their role of “queuer-consumers” – sensed, defined and shaped’ (pp. 17–18). The said fragment of life has been termed ‘shortage economy experience’, while the series of ties and social roles linked to it that of the ‘queuing society’. It is this latter designation which has been specified by Mazurek as

one defining the situational (unfixed in time and social hierarchy) division of society into the unprivileged, consequently those forced to wait in queues, and the privileged, who at a given moment could allow themselves to avoid them.

In the Polish People's Republic, the author claim,

everyone moved between the world of the queue and its avoidance. Some were chiefly supplicants and were forced – as a result of the limited social and economic stocks – to wait in a queue for bread, a flat or a higher salary. Others had at their disposal a sufficient set of social roles to enable them the power of distribution or sale of certain goods or which allowed them to find themselves – in certain situations – beyond the division into supplicant and holder (e.g. those involved in the black market).

Queuing society – Mazurek concludes accordingly – is

a general model of interaction, present at all levels of the social structure, which ascribes to people the roles of supplicants and holders of goods.

What is worthy of emphasis is the author's theoretical inspirations. These are the works of anthropologists and Polish sociologists who have dealt with the question of society in the PRL. Amongst whom a special role is ascribed to Andrzej Siciński, Jacek Tarkowski and Elżbieta Tarkowska as well as Stefan Nowak.

Mazurek does not merely present five different studies of cases constituting their own variations on the subject of 'queuing society'. Extremely important is that each of these sketches is written through the utilisation of a somewhat different methodology.

The first chapter ['Jumping the queue: individual resourcefulness in times of crisis'] is constructed through the application of a method referred to as an ethnographic revisit. The author reached two families in Bydgoszcz, who in 1978–80 were the subject of biographical interviews conducted by sociologists concentrated around Andrzej Siciński. Thanks to this it was possible to talk to them not only about daily life in the 1970s but also about the changes which occurred later on. One of the families obtained a good material position under real socialism thanks to the head of the family's employment as a taxi driver. For the other a source of good earnings – besides employment in 'a permanent position', allowing access to deficit goods (a meat plant) and benefits derived from social insurance – was tourist trade. In analysing the lot of the individual family members Mazurek shows how the shuffling of stocks of resourcefulness occurred: that which guaranteed a relatively high level of life in the PRL lost its significance in Poland post-1989. As a result

after a few years of the transformation of the political-economic system all the members of the families involved in the research became hired employees.

This otherwise unusually competent analysis based on an interesting collection of reading material leans towards an asking of questions as to the typicality of the biographical journeys described. The author does not, however, involve herself in this matter. Yet the argumentation of the findings that 'private entrepreneurship' in the PRL does not necessarily have to transfer itself into professional success within Poland post-1989 appears to be extremely important in discussions into the question of the socio-economic problems connected with the change in system that occurred post-1989.

The second chapter ['Dishonest shop-assistants: the institutionalisation of a social climate'] contains considerations on what was the social view of those employed in trade, in what way they were stigmatised and how they were given to the mechanism of psychologisation in a shortage economy. The author claims that the association of them with such concepts as 'the criminal bourgeoisie' describing them by the application of pejorative terminology ('desire for enrichment', 'a debauched life style') was conducive to the creation of legal norms derived from the assumption as to their immanent dishonesty (*vide* the act of 17 June 1959 on the material joint responsibility of employees for shortages). These norms – paradoxically – instead of shaping attitudes of honesty in traders were favourable to abuses to client detriment. The author shows how the vicious circle of stigmatisation of shop assistants, treated with suspicion both by consumers and decision makers, worked.

The third chapter ['Cross border shopping tourism between the PRL and the GDR: distribution conflicts and ethnicity'] explores a subject that has for a certain time now aroused growing interest amongst historians:¹ this refers to the peregrination abroad undertaken chiefly for reasons of trade. The author treats this as an example of 'jumping the queue', avoiding the system imposed barriers hampering access to sought after goods and services. What is especially valuable in this part of her deliberations is the attempt made to answer the question as to how the established national stereotypes influenced the mutual perception of trade activities of Poles and Germans from the GDR, how the memory of recent history has become embroiled in narratives about shortages. Mazurek expertly shows how the criterion of nationality was introduced into the East-German system of rationing of sought-after goods, which were to be protected from being bought up by Polish traders (this was symbolised by till operators in GDR shops extracting from underneath the counter a sign which read 'Only for Germans' and displaying this to Polish traders). She correctly proves that distribution conflicts in this case fulfilled an integrating role, and deepened the sense of national community.

¹ See first and foremost the works of Jerzy Kochanowski, in particular: *Tylnymi drzwiami. "Czarny rynek" w Polsce 1944–1989* (Warsaw, 2010).

The book's fourth chapter [“The Lodz “welfare state”: gender and the politicisation of the experience of shortage’] constitutes an attempt to apply the perspective of gender to research into social history. The author attempts to prove the thesis that gender could have been an effective means of politicising the question of supply (like during the hunger marches in 1981), manifesting women's disadvantage in the sphere of work and pay as well as in social welfare benefits. She writes about the workplace as about an expanse of the household, as a place of the already mentioned ‘queue jumping’. Małgorzata Mazurek calls into question, on the example of Lodz, the thesis as to the PRL being an (overly) welfare state. It seems that this thesis requires greater reflection and that her outline may constitute only a contribution to the discussion.

The last chapter in the work (‘Organisations and the consumer movement in the PRL: experts in “queuing society”’) involves itself first and foremost in an analysis of the activities of the Federation of Consumers registered in 1981 and – to a lesser degree – earlier attempts at the institutionalising of this activity. The author equally recalls the ‘Solidarność’ consumer movement and various, at times extremely radical, propositions at regulating the distribution of goods. She also attempts to define what was the consumer movement within the conditions of the Polish shortage economy, what were its limitations and specific features.

The five stories recounted by Mazurek show how, through the regaining

of a least a minimal amount of influence on the distribution of goods, which people themselves produced, the ‘queuing society’ attempted to enforce not only economic well-being but also to regain a sense of justice and control over reality.

The mechanism called ‘queue jumping’ is inscribed into a desire ‘to find for oneself a small scrap of control over the area of consumption.’

What appears to me to be especially valuable in Małgorzata Mazurek's work, besides the particular findings arrived at on the basis of extensive and varied sources, is the illustration of a different than the traditional (‘we’ – ‘they’) understanding of the line of division within Polish society before 1989. The author – as is borne out first and foremost by the analysis of the situation of retail employees – does not treat the institutional order of the PRL (in the part which concerns the deliberations undertaken by her) as a form of paranoia difficult to comprehend. She correctly notes, even if she is not always able to convincingly prove this, that institutionalised order (in the case of her analysis that of retail) was a phenomenon possessing ‘a certain rationalism’. It is this attempt to understand its essence that I value the most.

Mazurek has significantly complicated the picture of society in the PRL. In her sketches she has attempted to test the usefulness of various approaches

for social research. The language of the work and the application of conceptual methods prove the depth of reading within the relevant sociological and anthropological literature.

The work's initial assumption involving the combination of five individual studies into a single book through a common leading thread is obviously a solution that arouses reservation. In this case equally such a reservation may be formulated. One may ask: why in a book about queuing society is there, e.g., no sketch of the social complication involved in the acquisition of certain consumer goods, those particularly significant (equally from the political point of view) within the PRL (e.g. meat or alcohol)? One may wonder as to how far the concept of 'queuing society' has a more universal character, and what changes it underwent during the period 1944–89. In order to answer this question one would have to conduct a more systematic and laborious form of research. This in no way, however, alters the conclusion that we hold before us a book worthy of discussion.

trans. Guy Torr

Dariusz Jarosz