

"Questiones medii aevi novae", vol. 3, 1998. Foreign experts, Warszawa 1998, Instytut Historyczny Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 349 pp.

The role played by foreigners in the development of individual countries and regions is frequently discussed in historiography for it is connected with such important questions as, for instance, the growth of culture and civilisation, the shaping of national identity, economic transformations, changes in social structures and the rise of various conflicts. This role is the subject of Volume 3 of the revived periodical "Questiones", published in English, German and French and devoted to the Middle Ages in Polish and world history. The volume slightly exceeds the chronological framework indicated by the title for it also deals with the beginning of the modern era (16th century). As regards geography, it covers the territories of Poland, Lithuania and Hungary. E. F ü g e d i and J. M. B a k write about knights of foreign origin in Hungary (*Fremde Ritter im mittelalterlichen Ungarn*, pp. 3–18) and T. J u r e k about foreign knights in Poland (*Fremde Ritter im mittelalterlichen Polen*, pp. 19–50). In Hungary foreign knights helped Stephen, the first crowned king of Hungary, to come to power, and Stephen's followers also profited by the support of immigrant knights who, as a result, were absorbed into Hungary's political élite in the 11th and 12th centuries. The authors analyse the composition of the group of immigrants, their origin, the methods they used to enter the service of Hungarian rulers, the policy of marriages contracted by the newcomers with the daughters of local families, and the foreigners' gradual assimilation to the local knighthood. Jurek analyses similar question with regard to medieval Poland, from the first Piast kings to the end of the 14th century, paying special attention to the Silesian territories, where the inflow of foreign knights exerted a particularly strong influence on socio-cultural structures, leading, among other things, to the Germanisation of the language and customs of the local ducal courts. But in other regions of Poland the large inflow of foreign knights also had an influence on social relations, especially on the social structures of the estate of knights.

K. O z ó g (*Les juristes italiens au service de la diplomatie polonaise sous Ladislas Jagellon*, pp. 51–74) discusses the inflow of Italian jurists into Poland during the reign of Ladislas Jagellon and the role they played in Polish diplomacy, e.g. in the Polish delegation to the Councils of Constance and Basel and in the legal aspects of the conflicts between Poland and the Teutonic Knights' Order at that time. The study presents pen portraits of the Italian experts and analyses their co-operation with Polish jurists. S. S z y b k o w s k i (*Polish Staff as a Social Group in the Chancery of Grand Duke Witold*, pp. 75–94) presents the group of Poles who worked in the Lithuanian Chancery; he discusses their origin, social status, education, age, the way in which they obtained work in the Lithuanian Chancery, the internal hierarchy of the office and the relations there, especially the Poles' attitude to the Grand Duke and the Lithuanian officials, and the reasons why Poles were employed in the Chancery.

K. S k u p i e ń s k i's study (*Did Foreign Comites Palatini Imperiali and Apostolica Auctoritate, Nominators of Public Notaries, Visit Poland during the Fifteenth and the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century?*, pp. 95–103) raises an important but little known question of the emergence and functioning of public notaries in Poland in the 15th and early 16th centuries and the role played in this respect by foreign nominators, the Apostolic See (*apostolica auctoritate*) and imperial

nominators (*imperiali auctoritate*). The author also speaks of the role of public notaries in raising the level of civilisation of Polish society.

The next four studies deal mainly with socio-economic history at the end of the Middle Ages. They present various aspects of foreigners' activity in the economic field. M. Barański (*Fremde Stedlungsunternehmer in Ermland im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert*, pp. 105–136) writes about the recruiters of settlers (*locatores*) in Ermland in the 13th and 14th centuries, when settlement activities were very intensive and Ermland enjoyed rapid general development. The author depicts Ermland's political situation at that time, analyses the structure of land ownership and then discusses the origin of the *locatores* (he says they came mainly from neighbouring territories, from the environs of Malbork, Toruń, Gdańsk and Elbląg, the number of *locatores* from more distant regions being much smaller). Barański then discusses the differences in their ethnic origin (Germans, Prussians, etc.), their financial situation and social standing. He analyses the settlement privileges the *locatores* obtained (they were granted larger holdings, could set up inns, mills and the like, and could make use of additional profitable activities). He is also interested in the settlement technique, that is, in the measuring of land, its division, the recruitment and transportation of new settlers; he tries to appraise the costs and profits of the settlement operations and discusses the construction of the socio-legal system in the new settlements. E. Malysz's essay (*The Four Tallóci Brothers*, pp. 137–176) presents the extremely interesting economic and socio-political career of a family of Balkan origin (from the Curzola island in the Adriatic) which was absorbed into the Hungarian aristocracy. The members of the Tallóci family played an important role in political life and in the stormy conflicts in Hungary in the middle of the 15th century. D. Mołenda (*Die Betätigung fremder Fachleute im Erzbergbau im mittelalterlichen Polen*, pp. 177–204) discusses the role of foreign experts in the development of ore mining in Poland, stressing their high qualifications and universal technical knowledge, qualities which enabled them to make a career. U. Sowina (*Le maitres fontainiers dans les villes de Pologne du bas Moyen Age et début de l'époque moderne — experts étrangers ou spécialistes polonais?*, pp. 205–219) presents the little known question of water supplies in Polish towns at the end of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th century. On the basis of scatters and frequently laconic notes in sources, the author, rejecting stereotyped opinions, reconstructs the origin and nationality of the technicians who built and conserved water and sewage installations.

At the end of the volume the reader will find four brief presentations of latest research in various fields (*Current Research Section*, pp. 221–286). These are: T. Jasiniński's *The Golden Bull allegedly issued in 1226 by Friedrich II for the Teutonic Order*; J.A. Chrościcki's *La vie et la mort de Wladyslaw III Jagiellon sur les dessins de Jacopo Bellini*; J. Chudzinkowa's *Chronology of the Oldest Stage of the Romanesque Church in Trzemeszno*; and C. Buśko's *Die Burg Lahn im 12.–17. Jahrhundert*. The volume ends with a survey of notable publications concerning the Middle Ages (*Book Notices*, pp. 287–347).

The volume is noteworthy in that the nine studies mentioned above focus on one subject, namely, the role of foreign experts in the development of various fields of life. Like volumes I and II of "Questions", the latest volume is not a compilation of thematically different studies but a coherent presentation of a single subject. The studies, contributed by Polish and foreign authors, discuss the question in a broad geographical and socio-political context of East Central Europe, an area in which immigrants played an extremely important role. It is regrettable that no study has been devoted to Bohemia and to the territory of Prussia, especially to the activity of the Teutonic Knights there, for this is a subject which still raises controversies in historiography. The presentation of the important contribution made by foreign settlers to the development of civilisation in medieval societies (especially the diffusion of socio-political and cultural innovations) and to their functioning (more attention should perhaps have been paid to

the conflicts generated by them), will undoubtedly inspire researchers to continue their studies. Historians of medieval towns can also have much to say on this subject.

Marta Bogucka

Borys A. G u d z i a k, *Crisis and Reform. The Kyivan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Genesis of the Union of Brest*, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1998 Harvard University Press, 489 pp., bibliogr., illustr., indexes of personal and geographical names.

The author of this monograph is a historian of the Church, a Slavic and Byzantine history researcher. Trying to explain the genesis of the Union of Brest he places special emphasis on the relations between the Kyivan Metropolitanate and the Patriarchate of Constantinople. He is less interested in the relations between members of the Orthodox Church and Catholics in the Kingdom of Poland and later in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Such an approach to the subject may introduce new, interesting elements to the so far controversial question of the genesis of the Union of Brest. However, the complicated problem of this genesis and the reasons for the ecclesiastical union between the Orthodox Church and the Apostolic See in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth cannot be adequately explained if one underestimates the significance of the position of the Orthodox population in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and confines oneself to quoting from the out-dated Ukrainian historiography (K r i p y a k e v i c h, H r u s h e v s k y) general statements that the Orthodox people were treated as second-rate citizens. Although the author does not completely avoid the problems of the Commonwealth background, he treats them in a schematic way, not devoid of simplifications and many factual mistakes. He clearly shows that these problems are foreign to him.

The monograph has a very original construction. It is neither chronological nor consistent in the division of its subject matter. Thus chapter I concerns the predicament of the Orthodox population in the Turkish Empire after 1453, the next chapter presents the reforms introduced by Patriarch of Constantinople Jeremy II and his contacts with Western Europe, while chapter III takes us a hundred years back and shows the circumstances of the Florentine Union and the attitude of the Kyivan Metropolitanate to the idea of a union between Orthodoxy and Catholicism. The subsequent parts of the book to a larger extent follow chronology and division according to subjects. Thus chapters IV and V present the crisis in the Kyivan Metropolitanate and the influence of the Reformation and the Counter-reformation on the Orthodox Church in Poland. The next chapter discusses the missions of patriarchs to the East of Europe, while chapter VII presents the role of printing in the life of the Orthodox community. In further parts of his work the author presents the reforms of Konstanty Ostrogski, the Lwów confraternity, the missions of Patriarchs Joachim of Antioch and Jeremy of Constantinople to the East of Europe and to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the rise of the Moscow Patriarchate and the influence of Patriarch Jeremy II on the reforms in the Kyivan Metropolitanate. The last chapter concerns the Union of Brest itself.

It is worth emphasizing the author's two theses. The first one concerns the situation of the Orthodox population in the Ottoman Empire, the second the attitude of the Kyivan Metropolitanate to the Florentine Union. They both substantially contribute to the construction of his hypothesis about the genesis of the Union of Brest. The crisis that affected the Orthodox community in Turkey after 1453 did not result, in the author's opinion, only from their political dependence and the status of second-rate citizens, but above all from the complete collapse of education. The cultural downfall was connected with the underdevelopment of printing, also in the field of theology. The situation of the Orthodox

Church in Western and Central Europe was completely different. The author writes about many Byzantine scholars visiting Italy, about the Orthodox theology, education and printing flourishing there. Thus from the middle of the 15th c. onwards a gap grew between the intellectual level of Orthodoxy in countries dominated by Catholicism and in the territory of Turkey.

While presenting the attitude of the Kyivan Metropolitane to the Florentine Union Borys A. Gudziak very strongly emphasizes the attachment of Ruthenians to the idea of their ties with Rome. He perceives symptoms of such an attitude as early as the end of the 15th c. and the beginning of the 16th c. As an example he shows the attitude of Józef Bołharynowicz, bishop of Smolensk, who in 1498, following his nomination as a Kyivan metropolitan, spoke for the Florentine Union. In 1500 bishop Erazm Ciołek brought the metropolitan's letter to Pope Alexander VI in Rome. In his reply the Pope said he was pleased indeed with the Kyivan archbishop's attitude, but expressed a reservation that the metropolitan received his confirmation not from the Uniate patriarch, Cardinal Giovanni Michele, but from an Orthodox patriarch. The author interprets this statement as a proof that a conviction prevailed in Rome that the Catholic faith finds its identification only in the Latin rite. Thus he suggests that Rome alone was guilty of Kyiv leaving the Union, and he charges the Roman-Catholic clergy in Poland and Lithuania with direct responsibility for it. He quotes as a proof the 1502 polemic of Jan Sa k r a n, Professor of Cracow University, with the errors of "the Ruthenian rite". The author concludes that it is no wonder that after Józef Bołharynowicz there were no manifestations of support for the Florentine Union on the part of Ruthenians (pp. 55-56).

In discussing the situation and events directly contributing to the genesis of the Union of Brest the author draws attention to the critical state of the Orthodox Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the second half of the 16th c. This development, in his opinion, on the one hand resulted from the influence of Protestantism and Counter-reformation, on the other was bound up with a moral and organizational crisis in the Orthodox Church herself. Among the symptoms of this phenomenon Gudziak perceives the influence of the magnates and the gentry on the appointments to Church offices, simony, the downfall of education and of theological thought as well as a relative discrimination against the Orthodox community in comparison with Catholics. He also emphasizes the slackening of the ties between Kyiv and Constantinople (the latter, also for financial reasons, was mainly intent on maintaining its ties with Moscow). The Orthodox Church in the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, in the author's opinion, seems to have been a neglected institution, forsaken by her natural superior authority — the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

B. A. Gudziak presents various initiatives taken in the Orthodox community in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, aimed at the improvement of this situation. This was, on the one hand, the activity of Duke Konstanty Ostrogski, the rise of Orthodox confraternities in major towns, initiatives coming from the Orthodox Church hierarchy, and finally reforms initiated by Patriarch Jeremy II. The author emphasizes that these actions were frequently contradictory and there was no co-ordination in their implementation. All this only augmented the general chaos which annoyed in the first place the Orthodox bishops.

In Gudziak's opinion in the late 1580s and early 1590s the Orthodox community in the Commonwealth showed a favourable attitude towards the union with Rome. There were exponents of such an attitude among the episcopate and the upper ranks of the clergy, as well as among the magnates and the gentry. These tendencies, in the author's opinion, seemed to be also favoured by Patriarch Jeremy II. The episcopate connected their hopes for the Union with their aspirations for the emancipation from the deep subordination to the magnates and gentry and their strivings to subjugate the Orthodox confraternities. The endeavours to conclude the Union were speeded up by the mission of Patriarch Jeremy II in the Commonwealth in the years 1588-1589. Although he introduced, however

a number of reforms, such as curtailing simony and disciplining the clergy, yet at the same time he undermined the position of the episcopate. His actions included the creation of new confraternities, excluded from the bishops' jurisdiction (in Wilno), the deposition of the Kyivan Metropolitan Onisiphor Dziwochka (because of the simony) and nomination of Cyryl Terlecki, the bishop of Łuck, as exarch, which placed him above the new Kyivan Metropolitan Mikhail Rahoza. In the author's opinion the deposition of Dziwochka was especially shocking. In presenting subsequent actions leading to the conclusion of the Union of Brest, he attributes the whole initiative to the Orthodox episcopate, or more precisely speaking to its most active part (Cyryl Terlecki, Hłpacy Pocij, Gedeon Bałaban), and merely mentions the actions taken by the Catholic side, treating them not as an initiative but a support. Nor does he perceive in the person of King Sigismund III either the initiator or a great advocate of the Union.

The author pays much attention to Duke Konstanty Ostrogski's religious policy. On the one hand he points out the utopian character of the Kyivan voivode's vision of the Union; in fact Ostrogski wanted to conclude it with the approval of all the Orthodox patriarchs. The author emphasizes, however, that the bishops didn't consult Ostrogski about their actions and that bishop Pocij was mainly responsible for this attitude. Unfortunately, Gudziak does not explain why the bishops were acting this way. At any rate, when in June 1595 Pocij informed Ostrogski very shortly about preparations for the Union, the Duke felt offended. We can certainly agree with the author that one of the reasons for the opposition presented to the Union by Orthodox magnates and gentry was their exclusion from actions leading to its conclusion, yet it seems insufficient to say that Ostrogski didn't perceive the requirements of the changing world.

One of major defects of this interesting book is the fact that the author does not know the history of Poland and of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. This deficiency comes to light in his discussion of many questions, among others the development of Orthodox printing industry and Orthodox confraternities; on this occasion the author makes comparisons not with Poland, but with Italian states (p. 146)! This is also shown in his many interpretations which prompt reservations. Thus, one can hardly agree with his conviction that the abolition of the Kyivan Duchy in 1471 and the transformation of its territory into the Kyivan voivodeship meant the final liquidation of the political institutions of Kyivan Ruthenia (pp. 60/61), since Halitsch-Vladimir Duchy, the successor to Kyivan Ruthenia, was absorbed by Poland and Lithuania as early as 1340. The territory of the Kyivan region that previously constituted a part of Halitsch-Vladimir Duchy, was in 1363 annexed to Lithuania and became a district granted as a feud to the representatives of the younger offshoot of the family of Great Lithuanian Dukes. Thus the Kyivan Duchy existing in 1363-1471, apart from its name, had nothing in common with Kyivan Ruthenia. The author is right in saying that after Lithuania adopted Catholicism, the legal situation of the Orthodox population deteriorated, however, he forgets that even before the Union of Lublin in 1569 the Orthodox gentry in Lithuania had the same rights as the Catholic gentry.

Especially irritating are some mistakes in facts. Contrary to what the author says, there was no office of Samogitian *voivode* (p. 109), but there was an office of Samogitian *starosta (capitaneus)* with the voivode's competences. Duke Konstanty Ostrogski was not a Kyivan voivode from 1524 till 1608. The author shows in this case considerable absent-mindedness, for the fact of fulfilling a senator's function allegedly for 84 years should have made him wonder (p. 119). In fact Duke Konstanty, born in 1527, became Kyivan voivode only in 1559. Apart from that the author prolonged the life of Grand Hetman of Lithuania and Voivode of Troki, the Duke's father (also named Konstanty), by three years, providing the information that he died in 1533. He also writes misleadingly that Konstanty Ostrogski owned 6,000 villages, although he does mention that this number may be exaggerated (p. 120). At the same time he says that in 1603, after Konstanty's death when his inheritance was divided, the remaining brothers: Janusz and

Aleksander received 57 towns and castles, 657 villages and 11 farms, that is far less than the mythical number of 6,000 villages. Nor can one accept the information that Duke Konstanty Ostrogski, Kyivan voivode as an Orthodox Ruthenian, was discriminated against both as a candidate to the Polish throne in 1587 as well as to many other public functions. This information is not supported by any examples, nor the fact of Ostrogski's candidature to the Polish throne in 1587 is known to the Polish historiography. Gudziak accepts without many reservations Hrushevsky's misleading thesis that Orthodox confraternities in Lwów and Wilno were the continuation of the pre-Christian *brachinas*, although he admits that in respect of their functions and structures they resembled Catholic brotherhoods (p. 145). One cannot agree, either, with his uncritical acceptance of Kripyakevich's thesis (1907) that while towns in Poland were developing intensively as early as the 15th and 16th cc., this development did not reach the Ukraine until the end of the 16th c. (the author speaks of the Ukraine in its present borders, p. 146). According to the findings of recent historiography (Maria Bogucka, Henryk Samsonowicz, *Dzieje miast i mieszczaństwa w Polsce przedrozbiorowej* [The History of Towns and Townspeople in Pre-partition Poland], Wrocław 1986) this question does not seem so simple. Indeed, at the turn of the 15th c. the urbanization of all Ruthenian lands both in the Polish Crown as well as in Lithuania was weaker than in Great Poland, Little Poland and especially in Royal Prussia. However in Western Ukraine the degree of urbanization was higher than in the Eastern part. On the other hand such towns as Lwów or Kamieniec Podolski developed as intensively as other cities of the Polish Crown. The date of the conquest of Smolensk by Sigismund III (p. 193), mistakenly given as 1610 instead of 1611 may be treated as a minor error. It is not true, that in 1793 the Uniate Kyivan Metropolitans won seats in the Senate, they acquired them two years earlier (p. 238). The information that in 1596 Lew Sapieha was a Crown Chancellor is also wrong, he was a Lithuanian Chancellor. At the Synod of Brest the king was not represented by Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł as the Voivode of Troki and Grand Marshal of Lithuania, since the post of Grand Marshal was then vacant (p. 239), while Radziwiłł himself was at that time only the Voivode of Troki, and he ceased to be Grand Marshal of Lithuania as early as 1586. Some of the author's ideas about the spelling of historical surnames or first names are curious indeed. One of the examples may be the Polish King Jogalla (p. 69), instead of Władysław Jagiełło, or in the form accepted in English — Jagiello.

One should also point out the shortcomings of the methods of carrying out the work. The list of printed sources does not include *Acta Nuntiaturae Polontae*, published currently (beginning with 1990) in Rome. Surprisingly the author does not take into account an important source edition, relevant to the Union of Brest *Die Hauptinstruktionen Clemens VIII*, published in Tübingen in 1984 by Klaus Jaitner. The author does not know of such important source editions as *Korespondencja Hieronima Rozdrażewskiego* (Hieronim Rozdrażewski's Correspondence), embracing the years 1582–1600, published by Paweł Czaplowski (Toruń 1939), or Jan Wielewicki's *Dziennik spraw domu zakonnego oo. Jezuitów u św. Barbary w Krakowie* (A Diary of the Matters of Jesuit Fathers' Saint Barbara's Religious House in Cracow), published by Józef Szuj ski (Kraków 1881). The list of the literature, apart from a few exceptions, does not include Polish works published after 1945. Thus e.g. the author does not mention *Historia Kościoła w Polsce* (The History of Church in Poland, Warszawa–Poznań 1974) where we find a chapter concerning the origin of the Union of Brest; nor does he take into account Leszek Jarm iński's work *Bez użycia siły. Działalność polityczna protestantów w Rzeczypospolitej u schyłku XVI wieku* (Without Violence. The Political Activity of Protestants in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth towards the End of the 16th c., Warszawa 1992), Jan Rzońca's *Rzeczpospolita Polska w latach 1596–1599. Wybrane zagadnienia polityki wewnętrznej i zagranicznej* (Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the Years 1596–1599. Chosen Problems of Internal and Foreign Policy, Opole 1990) or Władysław Serczyk's monograph

Historia Ukrainy (A History of the Ukraine, Wrocław 1979), or the same author's *Na dalekiej Ukrainie. Dzieje Kozaczyzny do 1648 roku (In the Far-Off Ukraine. The History of the Cossacks until 1648, Wrocław 1984)*. Some German and Austrian works are also missing in the list, such as Gottfried Schramm's *Der polnische Adel und die Reformation 1548–1607* (Wiesbaden 1965) or Jan Paul Niederkorn's treatise *Die europäischen Mächte und der "Lange Türkenkrieg" Kaiser Rudolfs II (1593–1606)* (Wien 1993), dealing both with the problems of the Union of Brest and the Empire's relations with Zaporozhe Cossacks. The author's unfamiliarity with the literature and sources sometimes leads to such errors as the mistaken dates of Henry of Valois' reign in Poland (1572–1574, instead of 1573–1574), or inaccuracy concerning papal diplomats. Thus in Poland there was no nuncio by the name of Niccolo Mascardi, while nuncio Camillo Mentovato fulfilled his function not between 1558–1560 but between 1558–1559; Giulio Rugieri was on a mission to Poland not between 1566–1567 but between 1565–1568. There are many mistakes like these relating to nuncios: Alberto Bolognetti, Girolamo de'Buoi and Claudio Rangoni. The first was a nuncio in Poland from 1581–1585, and not from 1581–1584, the second from 1584–1587 and not from 1584–1586, while the third held his office between 1598–1607 and not as B. A. Gudziak says between 1599–1606. No mention is made of papal legates: Giovanni Francesco Commendone (1571–1573), Ippolito Aldobrandini (1588–1589), the later Pope Clement VIII, or Enrico Caetani (1596–1597), active during the conclusion of the Union of Brest.

The author has taken up a difficult and ambitious task. Although he did not succeed in fully explaining the genesis of the Union of Brest, yet he presented it from an interesting perspective. It cannot be doubted that the efforts to improve the situation of the Orthodox Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and concern for the spiritual development of Orthodox population were essential factors in the efforts to conclude the Union. Gudziak, as a historian of the Church, has emphasized them. It can be only regretted that he did not appreciate political reasons as well.

Edward Opaliński

Józef Długosz, *Latyfundia Lubomirskich w XVII wieku. Powstanie — rozwój — podziały (The Latifundia of the Lubomirskis in the 17th Century. Their Foundation, Development and Division)*, Opole 1997, Uniwersytet Opolski, 167 pp., *Studia i monografie*, № 251.

During the last twenty-five years Polish publishers have brought out several monographs on magnates' latifundia in 17th century Poland as well as a number of treatises concerning economic and social history. Without these studies such subject as the one discussed by Długosz could not be presented in a broad context of economic, political and cultural history. It is enough to mention the symposium *(The Polish Magnates as a Social Class)* of the 11th General Congress of Polish Historians (Toruń 1974), the series of studies edited by Andrzej Wyczański *(Old Polish Society)*, the treatises by K. Chłapowski, S. Ciara, A. Pośpiech and W. Tygielski, A. Kersten's synthetic presentation of the class of magnates (an article in French in "Acta Poloniae Historica", vol. XXXVI, 1977, pp. 119–133) and the excellent book by W. Czaplinski and J. Długosz *(Everyday Life of Polish Magnates in the 17th Century)*, Warsaw 1976) published in a prestigious series of the State Publishing Institute.

Józef Długosz belongs to a group of authors who for several decades have focused attention on research into the Lubomirski (and also the Sobieski) families. A large part of recent studies on the Lubomirskis' status has been contributed by him, to mention only his tract *The Cultural Patronage and Court of Stanisław Lubomirski, Voivode of Cracow* (Wrocław 1972) and the book published three years earlier together with W. Czaplinski, *A Young Magnate Journeys to Study (Studies in the History of Culture in the 16th and 17th Centuries)*, Warsaw 1969),

frequently referred to by scholars engaged in research on Old Polish education. What facilitates research into the Lubomirski family is that the life stories of all its more important representatives are presented in the *Polish Bibliographic Dictionary*.

Already in the above-mentioned 1972 study the author devoted the 30-page Chapter II to the economic foundations of the Cracow voivode's patronage. However, as the years went by Długosz realised that intensive studies were still needed to fathom the question and he has now overfulfilled the task, devoting to it a thorough treatise based on sources. The presentation of the subject shows that Długosz is in full command of the rich material and vast literature concerning the question; this is reflected in his extensive use of notes, of which there are nearly a thousand (to be exact 988 in the main text and the source annex). The subject has been presented against a broad historical context. Długosz draws attention to the role of magnates in the Old Polish period, to the mechanisms of social advancement and the foundation of *latifundia*; most magnates, nearly all those who thanks to their ancestors' foresight belonged to the narrow circle of the state elite, were engaged in short-sighted activities, for they were constantly looking for cash of which they were always short. On the other hand, those who were only laying the foundations of their family's power acted differently; they strictly controlled expenses and focused attention on creating wealth. The Lubomirskis were not an exception, they were rather a model example.

The fortunes of Jan Zamoyski, Chancellor and Grand Crown Hetman, and of the first senator in the Lubomirski family, Sebastian, whose son held for many years a leading place among the dignitaries not only of his native Little Poland but of the whole Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, grew under the reign of Stephen Batory (1576-1586) and Sigismund III Vasa (1587-1632). Długosz uses them as examples to present the mechanisms of the genesis and growth (and later also of the diminution) of the greatest fortunes. Długosz is fully justified in using the word "*latifundium*" in the plural in the title of his work. The treatise has an impressive source base, but it is a pity that in his instructive preface the author does not present the essential features of this base, though he does so with regard to literature. The book consists of five chapters (in addition to the *Preface* and *Conclusion*), the first of which is a kind of synthesis (*The General Factors Favouring the Lubomirskis' Advancement*, pp. 9-47); the next four chapters are analytical; they are a chronological presentation, or rather a presentation of persons, for they concern the fate of the Lubomirskis' estates in four generations (Chapter II, *The Foundation of the Latifundium 1581-1613*, pp. 49-70; Chapter III, *The Development of the Latifundium 1613-1642*, pp. 71-85; Chapter IV, *The Lubomirskis' Latifundia after 1649*, pp. 87-97; Chapter V, *The Division of the Lubomirskis' Latifundia*, pp. 99-117). The book closes with a source annex (document of the division of the estates, issued at Łańcut on July 19, 1668), and indexes of persons and places.

Among the general factors which contributed to the family's advancement the author mentions relationship by marriage, high offices, obtaining of royal demesnes and special circumstances, for in 1636, by a decree of fate, the Cracow voivode took over a part of the Ostrogskis' estate after the extinction of the Ostrogski family, connected with the Lubomirskis by marriage, as well as exploitation of salt mines in Little Poland. In the course of half a century, Sebastian Lubomirski (1546-1613), an insignificant nobleman whose only achievement was the post of castellan of Wojnicz, became the owner of 105 villages and small towns and part-owner of another 18. He acted without scruples, divesting insolvent debtors of their property, granting many loans, also to monarchs, and receiving from the emperor the prestigious and enviable title of count of Wiśnicz. Since he knew well when to be ruthless and when to be elastic, the royal court willingly employed him in delicate mediations. He was undoubtedly one of the most enterprising magnates at the turn of the 16th century, but in addition to Jan Zbigniew Ossoliński and Zygmunt Grudziński, mentioned by the author on

p. 69, the group of enterprising magnates also included the forefather of powerful houses, Jan Zamoyski. Zamoyski, also devoid of scruples, was active slightly earlier, but he got farther, for in addition to landed estates he obtained the highest offices in the Commonwealth.

In a biography an individual is usually separated from a broader context; but in a specific situation a biography concerns more than one generation. Sebastian's son, Stanisław Lubomirski (1583–1649), would not have got so far had it not been for the financial foundation created by his father and the premature death of his brother, Joachim, his junior by five years, who died of plague during the Smoleńsk expedition in 1610; this averted the division of the *latifundium*. However, the *latifundium* was divided in the next generation, for the Cracow voivode had three sons only one of whom, Konstanty Jacek, died without issue in 1616. The two elder brothers (Aleksander Michał and the Grand Crown Marshal Jerzy Sebastian) divided the already divided *latifundia* (with separate management) among their sons. The decisions concerning these legacies lead one to a sad conclusion, especially when one sees the grotesque defence castle at Łańcut, the individual towers and wall sections of which had different owners. Through obsession with their private affairs the magnates lost the instinct of self-preservation in the 17th century and this had sinister consequences for the whole Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth.

The reader has received a well written useful study which will serve as a reference book for researchers, also art historians. Although the author has established so many facts, he modestly says in the *Conclusion* that there are still blanks in our knowledge of the financial foundations of one of the most prominent families in 17th century Poland; he hopes however that they will be filled by further research.

Marceli Kosman

Michał Kopczyński, *Studia nad rodziną chłopską w Koronie w XVII–XVIII wieku (Studies on the 17th–18th Century Peasant Family in Poland)*, Warszawa 1998, Wydawnictwo Krupski i S-ka, 208 pp.

Until fairly recently studies of the role of women and the family in the pre-industrial era have not enjoyed much interest in our country, although the issue of early family structures has long featured prominently in European historiography¹. Only in the 1990s did the pace of Polish research accelerate and its subject extend into the observation of woman's complex fortunes in and outside the family². This modest breakthrough in research into the history of Old Polish families is to some extent connected with the appearance of a new generation of historians who have renounced a schematic approach to and interpretation of social phenomena and more frequently and boldly apply statistical methods.

Michał Kopczyński set himself the ambitious task to answer the question "... what was the structure of peasant households, their developmental cycle and

¹ More extensively on this subject cf. C. Kukło, *Współczesne badania nad rodziną w Europie XVI–XVIII wieku (Contemporary Studies of the Family in 16th–18th c. Europe)*, in: *Rodzina — jej funkcje przystosowawcze i ochronne*, Warszawa 1995, p. 141 ff.

² See e.g. C. Kukło, *Rodzina w oświeceniowej Warszawie (The Family in 18th c. Warsaw)*, Białystok 1991; K. Makowski, *Rodzina poznańska w I połowie XIX wieku (The Family in Poznań in the First Half of the 19th c.)*, Poznań 1992; A. Karpiński, *Kobieta w mieście polskim w drugiej połowie XVI i w XVII wieku (Women in a Polish Town in the Second Half of the 16th and in the 17th c.)*, Warszawa 1995; K. Targosz, *Sawantki w Polsce w XVII w. Aspiracje intelektualne kobiet ze środowisk dworskich (Savantes in 17th c. Poland. The Intellectual Aspirations of Women from Court Circles)*, Warszawa 1997; C. Kukło, *Kobieta samotna w społeczeństwie miejskim u schyłku Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej. Studium demograficzno-społeczne (Single Women in Town Society at the Close of the Gentry Commonwealth. A Socio-demographic Study)*, Białystok 1998; M. Bogucka, *Białogłowa w dawnej Polsce. Kobieta w społeczeństwie polskim XVI–XVIII wieku na tle porównawczym (Women in Old Poland. Females in Polish 16th–18th c. Society. A Comparative Study)*, Warszawa 1998.

the life cycle of their inhabitants in the Polish Crown in the 17th–18th c.?" (p. 9). He based his deliberations on two main groups of manuscript sources: poll-tax registers of the Pomeranian province from 1662, and parish registers of population in the years 1791–1792 from Radziejów, Podgórze and Wieluń districts as well as printed inventories of gentry estates in Great Poland. Thus, territorially, his research has embraced Royal Prussia, Kujawy and Great Poland; chronologically — the second half of the 17th c. up till the close of the next century.

The book consists of five chapters, an *Introduction* and a *Conclusion*. Two chapters, i.e. ch. I — *The Household and Family as the Subject of Historical Research* (pp. 13–34) and ch. III — *Civil-Military Censuses and Inventories of Estates as the Sources for Research into the Peasant Family* (pp. 65–87) with much clarity introduce the reader to the complex contemporary international methodology of family studies. Moreover, they alert the author's potential successors to the basic deficiencies of the sources, especially the parish registers of population. By the way, one should stress the author's good knowledge and creative use of the subject's historiography, especially English works, presented in an extensive bibliography (almost 450 items).

Three other chapters have even greater value, since they present the researcher's most important statements. Thus in chapter II Kopczyński reconstructs the basic elements of the social structure of the peasant population, and then of their households in the Pomeranian province in 1662. His analyses are based on poll-tax registers prepared by parish priests, containing, apart from the name of the village and sometimes the name of its owner, the list of all inhabitants with the division into separate farms, thus not only (used until now) collective registers made by tax-collectors. Striving for the maximum completeness of his sources, the author has included in his detailed research 4,022 households inhabited by over 15 thous. people (i.e. over 1/3 of all peasants mentioned in the registers).

One should acknowledge the importance of Kopczyński's results concerning the social structure of royal domains in Gdańsk Pomerania, which differ from the picture presented so far on the basis of inspections. In the light of poll-tax registers there were fewer rich peasants, who amounted to 41%, but more peasants who made their living from animal husbandry or by jobs not connected with farming (about 1/3 of the total) and cottagers (p. 47). By adding to his calculations children who were omitted in fiscal registers, he has estimated the average size of a rich peasant's household at 7.9 inhabitants, inn-keeper's and miller's at 6.9 and cottager's at 4.2 people; thus his numbers are higher than those accepted so far (p. 50).

While writing about the family at the beginning of the second half of the 17th c., the author puts forward a hypothesis about a link between the socio-economic status of a farmer and the sex of those children who stayed with their parents (more sons stayed with wealthy farmers, and more daughters with cottagers) p. 52. Apart from the household head and his offspring the economic unit embraced kinsmen (we come across them in 9.4% of farms and they constituted 3.5% of the population under discussion) as well as farm hands: about two per a rich peasant's household and less than a half per a cottager's household. All in all the hired workers employed by local peasants made up about 1/5 of the totality of the local population, but as many as half of them were concentrated in 20% of the farms. The last group of household members on peasant farms in Gdańsk Pomerania, mostly female (the index of males — 52) in the author's opinion consisted of lodgers (9.4% of the total population). Although they were members of over 20% of the households, as many as two thirds of them lived in the homes of the richest peasants.

Kopczyński, it must be stressed, does not avoid comparisons with the rest of Europe, so important to this type of research. Thus the reader may be interested in his attempt to present the family structure of Pomeranian households according to P. Laslett's classification, generally applied in the Western historiography.

Kopczyński's results corroborate the fact characteristic of West-European countryside: the prevalence of a nuclear family (from 80 to 85%, depending on the socio-occupational group)³ and a modest percentage of households run by single persons — 3.1% (but as many as 8.7% among poorer people), and non-family households. On the other hand it turns out that in the light of Kopczyński's data there is no justification for suggestions that multiple-family households were more numerous and characteristic of Central Europe. They constituted only from 0.3 to 1.9% of the total.

In ch. IV (pp.89–114) the author has also included a socio-demographic characterization of the peasant family at the end of the 18th c., based on other sources. In this case he analysed 1,410 households of rich peasants in Kujawy and 218 households of cottagers, confronted additionally with households in the Wieluń district and other areas in Great Poland, sometimes reconstructed on the basis of inventories. Let us add after the author that the study of the social structure based on parish registers, created at the behest of civil-military order commissions, was more difficult, since their authors — generally parish priests — seldom distinguished small holders and craftsmen as separate groups.

Also in the case of households in Kujawy and Great Poland at the end of the 18th c., Kopczyński's study has shown an unquestionable correlation between the socio-economic status of the household head and the average number of its members; from 4.14 persons in the households of cottagers, 5.43 in those of millers and inn-keepers up to 7.15 in those of rich peasants. The average household size would be even bigger if we take into account the many lodgers dwelling there (p.91 ff.). Both values are higher than analogous indicators from North-Western Europe, but lower than the Russian 19th c. data. The essential differences in the average household size between various categories of the peasant farms in Kujawy and Great Poland result mostly from smaller numbers of children and farm hands among the poorer groups.

The typology of the peasant families in Kujawy and Great Poland reconstructed by Kopczyński does not differ considerably from the family structures of Pomeranian households in the 1660s under his analysis, with one exception — a greater number of extended families among rich peasants (9.4–14.7%) than among cottagers (4.3–6.2%). On the other hand about one-third of cottagers' households in Kujawy were run by single persons.

The confrontation with Alexander Chayanov's model of the cyclical development of a peasant farm has shown that the households discussed by the author were biggest during their prosperity, i.e. at the mature stage. At this and the earlier-initial stage they had the greatest number of servants and children. The kinsmen played a minor role, but the phenomenon of an "empty nest" concerned only about 9% of rich farmers and 14% of cottagers, which points to a high continuity of farms in Kujawy (p. 113).

The last chapter introduces some novelty to the hitherto, if few, studies of the demographic structure of the peasant family in late-feudal Poland (pp. 115–167). Kopczyński reconstructs here the typical life-cycle of a villein at the end of the 18th c. Childhood was short, as children usually left the family home between the age of 10 and 25, most frequently between 15–19, and even earlier among the poor. Most of them enriched the ranks of servants, but for many boys and girls (perhaps with the exception of those employed on gentry farms) this was a transitory stage. Kopczyński's detailed analyses have confirmed that the size and composition of a peasant household essentially depended on the external factor of labour dues. The balance of the workforce was mostly regulated by employing a smaller or greater number of farm hands, recruited from other peasants' children (p. 132).

³ It seems, however, that the percentage of nuclear families could in fact be higher, since single man-farmers or woman-farmers with one parent have been classified by the author as non-family households i.e. II b (p. 57), while they were households of a widower or widow with children, hence in Laslett's classification III c or III d (see p. 99).

In Kujawy the peasants tried to run the farm as long as possible, since old age (for men beginning at 64, for women at 50) most often signified an essential change of status — joining the ranks of annuitants or lodgers. Interestingly, the author's estimates show that nearly 17% of the oldest people spent their late years alone, despite having living children. Let us add that in contrast to women in Old Polish towns, peasant women very seldom ran the farms on their own — only 4.4% of the total of farm heads.

Despite all the values of this very interesting book, one would like to quarrel with M. Kopczyński about the status of lodgers in Old Polish villages. Although they were not described precisely in his sources, we would rather oppose his decision to include them in the economic units where they dwelled, especially if they were married (about 2/3 of the total at the end of the 18th c.). We think that more frequently they appeared as a hired workforce on other farms, even those of the neighbours. It seems that, just as it happened in Polish small towns, to say nothing of big towns, the majority of them preferred to work on their own account, and created separate lodgers' households. The situation was similar in the villages of Vistula Pomerania. The authors of the Prussian "historical tables" of 1774 treated Pomeranian lodgers as a separate stratum of rural population because they had their own households⁴. If our stand were accepted, one should introduce many corrections to Kopczyński's detailed assertions, especially as regards the strength and composition of peasant households.

Also the methodically interesting estimates of gaps in the parish censuses of population in Kujawy (the author uses on the one hand the subtle method of Carrier-Farrag, on the other he presents a large range of fertility co-efficients — from 40 to 59 per mille!) in fact do not inform us definitely about real omissions, which the author situates in the bracket from 10 up to 32% (p. 78). One should regret that he has not attempted to establish how large was the group of people living in definitive celibacy in the late-feudal countryside.

M. Kopczyński's book is very important. Notwithstanding the remarks made here, it seems that its original point is that the author presents the inner structure of rural households in a long time perspective and their socio-economic differentiation as well as in the possibly most extensive comparison with Europe. Kopczyński's study certainly does not close the research into the peasant family in the preindustrial era, but seriously enriches its hitherto modest achievements and encourages its continuation.

Cezary Kuklo

Polen, Deutsche und Juden in Lodz 1820–1939. Eine schwierige Nachbarschaft. Herausgegeben von Jürgen Hensel. Osnabrück 1999, Fibre Verlag, 370 pp. Einzelveröffentlichungen des Deutschen Historischen Instituts Warschau, Bd 1.

This volume is the first book in a series published by the German Historical Institute in Warsaw. The next publication, issued at the same time, is the book by Valentina Maria Stefanski, *Zwangsarbeit in Leverkusen, Polnische Jugendliche im I. G. Farbenwerk*. Alongside these volumes the Institute publishes a series of German translations of works by Polish historians and Polish translations of German historical works. The volume here under discussion is a developed and transformed sequel to the learned conference organized in Łódź jointly by the German Historical Institute and the Historical Institute of Łódź University in 1995. In 1997 the latter Institute published in Polish a volume edited by Paweł Samuś, entitled *Polacy–Niemcy–Żydzi w Łodzi w XIX–XX w. Sąsiedzi dalecy i bliscy (Po-*

⁴ See the opinion of M. Kędełski, a good expert both on this issue and on the historical-demographic sources, by the same author, *Ludność Pomorza Nadwiślańskiego w 1774 r. na podstawie tabel historycznych (The Population of Vistula Pomerania in 1774 on the Basis of Historical Tables)*, "Przeszość Demograficzna Polski", vol. 21, 1999 (in the print).

les-Germans-Jews in Łódź in the 19th–20th cc. *Distant and Close Neighbours* (Wydawnictwo Ibidem, 448 pp.) However, the German volume is not a translation, but a separate collection where apart from the majority — not all — of papers delivered at the conference there are also articles by German authors written especially for this edition. The Łódź volume was a record of the learned session and brought out papers in the order of their delivery. The German volume, free of this duty, has grouped the selected texts according to the main problems presented by the subject. A comparison of papers published in the “Łódź” volume with the present version lets one appreciate the effort of the editor who together with the authors created a coherent, well-elaborated work.

Here are the titles of the five parts of the volume: *Die Stadt und ihre Bewohner; Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft; Das politische Leben; Das Alltagsleben; Kultur und Sport*. They give us an idea of the problems discussed in it. There are 21 articles, 5 of which have been written by German-language researchers from the FRG and Switzerland. Although the participants in the conference of 1995 who assembled again in 1998 expressed the view that the history of later years (i.e. after 1939) should not be omitted, yet in the opinion of the editor of the book and co-translator of Polish texts, German historian Jürgen H e n s e l, an expert on Polish history and language who settled in Poland, the balanced co-existence of the three ethnic groups was broken when Poland was invaded by Germans in 1939. And it is precisely the co-existence of the main three ethnic groups of Łódź: Poles, Jews and Germans, that was the pivot of the conference and book under discussion.

One must admit that from the socio-ethnic point of view Łódź was a special centre in Poland where one could observe not only the co-existence of two or three national groups — a co-existence which could also be noticed in a large majority of Polish 19th and 20th c. towns until the catastrophe of 1939–1945, and which concerned other nationalities as well, such as Ukrainians and to a smaller extent Byelorussians or Lithuanians — but also a co-operation of the members of these ethnic communities imposed by industrialization and capitalist relations. Similar phenomena occurred, however to a lesser extent, in the smaller towns of the Łódź region, although the forms of co-existence typical of a big town could develop only in Łódź. It was quite another thing to see various nationalities living within the borders of the same town and maintaining a minimum of necessary mutual relations — this was the case of Poles and Jews in towns like Lublin and innumerable small Jewish-Polish towns — and quite another to see them take part in the capitalist economic life where everybody, regardless of his nationality, participates in the same economic process with his capital or work. Let us add that up till the First World War all the three nationalities living in Łódź had the similar status of subjects of the Russian Empire who did not belong to the privileged Russian ethnic community. In this respect their situation changed considerably after 1918. Parallel with the reconstruction of the Polish state one nationality gained a dominant status and at the same time the economic state-mate undermined the material basis of all social groups and strata.

Among the articles included in the volume under discussion one that draws attention is a text by Paweł S a m u ś, co-organizer of the conference which presents the general subject-matter of this event with special consideration to the concept defined in German as *Heimat*, which in Polish is translated by periphrasis; then the article by Blanka Pietrow-Ennker (Konstanz) who traces the emergence of a civil society in Łódź until 1914, a short paper by Bronisława K o p c z y ń s k a - J a w o r s k a *Der Eigene und der Fremde*, Marek B u d z i a r e k's work on denominational relations in Łódź (in fact it concerns the period up to 1914), which virtually imposed certain elements of religious toleration on this multi-denominational society. Among other works let us mention Marja K a m i ń s k a's article showing the influence of the multinational structure of Łódź on the popular Polish of this town. Many other articles also contain interesting data and theses. It seems that research into the period before 1914 found a stronger reflection in this volume than the inter-war period, which, although only 20 years

long, in every respect introduced new conditions into the population's life and co-existence. Only 6–7 amongst over 20 papers touch upon the latter period. From the point of view of the social integration of national and religious groups the inter-war period was rather regressive. It must be said that nationalism and national and/or religious enmity at that time gathered strength throughout Europe and resulted in Poland from the same phenomena that took place in other European countries.

The volume edited by Jürgen H e n s e l has been carefully elaborated. It is a pity that it does not include any illustrations, which enhance the visual side of the volume published by Łódź University.

Janusz Żarnowski

Ludwik H a s s, *Wolnomularze polscy w kraju i na świecie 1821–1999. Słownik biograficzny (Polish Freemasons at Home and Abroad 1821–1999. A Biographical Dictionary)*. Warszawa 1999, Rytm, 660 pp.

Ludwik Hass, an internationally recognized researcher into the history of freemasonry, has recently published another work, which without the slightest exaggeration can be called monumental. Of course, he wouldn't have been able to compile this *Dictionary* if he hadn't been for decades preoccupied with the history of freemasonry in Poland and the world over, or published over half a dozen books on this subject, at the same time collecting biographical materials, which he only in part put to use in his work *Masoneria polska w XX wieku (Polish Freemasonry in the 20th c.)*¹. This time, however, we have got a collection of all accessible biographical information on the Polish freemasons (in the broad sense of the word, to be discussed below) who were active not only in the Polish territory but also all over the world. The initial date is connected with the ban on freemasonry in Congress-Poland, issued by Prince Governor Józef Zajączek; this ban closed the first stage of the history of Polish freemasonry which until that time had brought together representatives of nearly all the enlightened classes. In 1929 Stanisław Małachowski–Łempicki's book appeared, containing a list of the lodges and Polish freemasons active in the years 1738–1821², a supplement to which was published by Hass some time ago³. This book additionally justifies adopting that initial date, especially as the list from 1738–1821 embraces about 5,000 names, while the current biographical dictionary, concerning the period of mostly conspiratorial activity of the lodges, including the campaign against them by those "well-thinking" and a few large emigration waves of the Polish intellectual élite, contains about 2,000 biographies and mentions. Naturally, the author could not succeed in tracing some closer information, going beyond the name and the probable contact with the freemasonry, in many cases, especially as regards little known or completely unknown persons from provincial and foreign centres, mostly in the 19th c. The *Dictionary* mentions of course those cases where we possess some more or less credible confirmation of their contact; it must be taken into account that the affiliation with freemasonry was and is not open and has often been forbidden by the authorities and persecuted by the Church and all kinds of nationalists, and occasionally also by the extreme Left. Thus such a

¹ L. H a s s, *Masoneria polska w XX wieku. Losy, loże, ludzie (Polish Freemasonry in the 20th c. Fortunes, Lodges, People)*. 2nd ed., Warszawa 1996, *ibid.*: *Słownik biograficzny wolnomularzy polskich XX wieku (A Biographical Dictionary of Polish Freemasons in the 20th c.)*, pp. 157–280.

² S. Małachowski–Łempicki, *Wykaz polskich łóż wolnomularskich oraz ich członków w latach 1738–1821 (An Index of Polish Freemasons' Lodges and Their Members in 1738–1821)*, Kraków 1929.

³ L. H a s s, *Sektą masoniistów warszawskiej. Pierwsze stulecie wolnomularstwa w Warszawie (1721–1821) (Warsaw Freemasons' Sect. The First Century of Freemasonry in Warsaw, 1721–1821)*, Warszawa 1980.

biographical dictionary can never provide a full list, especially as regards recent and contemporary times. Nevertheless Hass takes his *Dictionary* up to the present moment (1999) and mentions several score names of freemasons active after 1944 and partly to this day at home, and even a greater number of those active abroad.

As I have already mentioned, the *Dictionary* takes into account persons of Polish extraction in the ethnic sense, as well as those born in the Polish territory, or strictly speaking, as the author says, "all those born in the culturally Polish territories are here treated as members of the broadly-conceived Polish community. These territories from the second half of the 19th c. up till the end of World War II were largely convergent with the territories of the Second Republic of Poland" (p. 15) [i.e. Poland of 1918–1939 — note J.Ż.]. A large group of those people, especially in the 19th c., took part in the freemasons' movement outside Polish borders. In this case the author also thought it necessary to take into account the people of Polish extraction born abroad, but moving in Polish milieus. Obviously such broad, and at the same time imprecise criteria required both much research and many decisions about particular individuals. Even the problem of the transcription and distortion of Polish surnames and place-names in foreign-language publications created many obstacles in itself.

Naturally public opinion was much alarmed by the membership of many persons in the freemasonry, which was a favourite subject of gossip circulating in some milieus and the subject of accusations against political or ideological adversaries. The author says that he has relied mainly on freemasons' archival documentation (where it was accessible, and to the extent that it was possible to use, as in France, where its great volume simply defies research), and on documents printed in publications and periodicals, as well as expert analyses. As regards the testimonies of other people, he only took into consideration very clear statements by freemasons who mentioned the members of lodges with whom they got in touch themselves.

Particular entries contain general biographical data, information on a given person's activity as a freemason together with his rank, function and affiliation to a lodge, and finally a list of sources used. Naturally, little is known of some persons, and frequently the information is residual. The general biographical information concerning the persons who have their own entries in the *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* (*Polish Biographical Dictionary*) or in other publications of similar authority, has been reduced.

The *Dictionary* is the main part of this book, but its content is larger. There are also two annexes. The first contains a list of Polish freemasons' organizations in the Polish territory and abroad. The second enumerates non-Polish lodges to which Poles belonged. Both annexes have been compiled by Maria Hass, and each contains not only the name of the lodge and its obedience but also the list of its members which may be confronted with corresponding entries in the *Dictionary*. The enormous effort required by this work can be seen from the number of about 130 countries and localities where Poles were members of the lodges as well as the number of lodges taken here into account: about 90 Polish and about 350 non-Polish.

This shows that I am not mistaken in defining this work as fundamental. Its import goes beyond the history of freemasonry in itself; the fortunes of individuals connected with it give us insight into various aspects of the history of 19th and 20th c. Poland, especially the fortunes of her political, social and intellectual élites.

Janusz Żarnowski

Jan Molenda, *Chłopi, naród, niepodległość — Kształtowanie się postaw narodowych i obywatelskich chłopów w Galicji i Królestwie Polskim w przededniu odrodzenia Polski (The Peasants, the Nation, Independence — The Emergence of the Peasants' National and Civic Attitudes in Galicia and the Polish Kingdom on the Eve of Poland's Rebirth)*, Warszawa 1999, Wydawnictwo Neriton, 366 pp.

Jan Molenda is a well known scholar specialising in the history of the peasant movement and the struggle for Poland's independence in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The book under review is a summing up of the results of his research, extensive fragments of which have already been published. Unfortunately the book concerns only Galicia and the Polish Kingdom, to the exclusion of the Prussian zone of Poland which Molenda mentions only marginally writing about the periodical "Gazeta Grudziądzka" on p. 261. In my view this has impoverished the book for, despite different conditions, peasant parties were set up at that time also in Great Poland, Pomerania and even Mazuria, regions where papers and periodicals, to mention only "Gazeta Grudziądzka", reached broad ranks of peasants. Thus, national and civic consciousness developed among the peasants of the Prussian part of Poland, though the distribution of accents was undoubtedly different there.

The author has based his book on many sources. First and foremost he has used peasant periodicals from that period, in particular the letters sent in by peasants. He has thoroughly studied the issues of "Gazeta Ludowa" and "Piast", and made full use of the diaries of activists and peasants, including handwritten ones. He has examined the still underestimated collections of peasant emigrants' letters to their families in Poland and, as far as possible, has availed himself of the official documents of political parties.

Jan Molenda rightly points out that at the turn of the 19th century the development of national and civic attitudes accelerated, embracing ever broader ranks of peasants. National consciousness which at first denoted attachment to the "little homeland", that is, patrimony, changed its meaning; it came to embrace the ideological fatherland and the desire to have a state of one's own. The participation of peasants in public life increased. Use was made of the national tradition and of the experiences of the 1905 revolution, emigration and the world war. The author says that he will examine the peasants' relations with towns and their relations with Jews separately.

In Chapter I Molenda discusses the materials he has used. In his view, peasants' letters and articles provide more material than the mostly *ex post* written memoirs of peasants and intellectuals of peasant descent. During the period under review practically all peasant periodicals printed peasants' letters. The most important, in Molenda's view, were the letters published in "Piast" during the great war, for "Piast" greatly increased its circulation at that time and was in fact the only paper in Galicia and, to some extent also in the Polish Kingdom, to reach peasants. The author wonders whether the letters were corrected by the editors, as some remarks by the "Piast" editor Józef Rączkowski might suggest. He mentions outstanding peasant publicists, first and foremost Wincenty Witos and Jakub Bojko, but he does not mention Franciszek Wójcik, who wrote for "Przyjaciel Ludu" many articles on educational matters and the struggle for independence, especially the risings of 1794 and 1863. He says that up to 1915 papers in the Polish Kingdom, especially "Zaranie", could not write about independence because of censorship; later on difficulties were created by German censorship. Molenda is right when he says that the development of national consciousness among peasants was a long process which lasted from the end of the 18th century to the Second World War. Its intensity differed in various periods and partition zones; the process started in Great Poland.

The concept of "common people" and their "leading place in the nation" underwent changes. The slogan was first launched as early as 1886 by Warsaw's

paper "Głos" and Lwów's "Przegląd Społeczny". According to Bolesław Wysłouch, "The common people are a community of the working classes", according to peasant activists in the Polish Kingdom, "the common people are the core of the nation".

An important role was played by school organisations and institutions. Despite low school attendance, this role was significant in all parts of Poland. In theory, a six-year school was compulsory in Galicia and a three-year one in the Polish Kingdom. Illiteracy was high, amounting to 68 per cent in Galicia and 70 per cent in the Polish Kingdom in 1900. It was mainly the elderly people who were illiterate. As schools in the Kingdom were russified, many village children attended secret schools which from the end of the 19th century were organised by Circles for Peasant Education and the Society for National Education; the idea to set up these schools was promoted first by the National Democratic Party and later by the Polish Socialist Party and the Polish Peasant Union. An important role was played by the school strike. The war showed the necessity of education and of abolishing illiteracy. The number of schools increased. Peasant teachers played a more important role in the Polish Kingdom than in Galicia.

In Chapter II the author discusses modernisation processes in the countryside and the role of women and youth in the overcoming of old habits. This, however, took place only after the 1905 revolution. In this period schools teaching household arts began to be organised for girls.

The author depicts the process of modernisation and peasant growing activity, taking the village of Kacice in the Pultusk region as an example. "Zorza" was the first periodical to reach the village; then the Polish Peasant Union began to operate in Kacice. Agricultural companies were set up, agricultural schools were opened. Kacice became an exemplary village. Its inhabitants took part *en masse* in the activity of the Polish Military Organisation and the disarming of Germans in the autumn of 1918.

The author presents local self-government as an institution spreading political culture and teaching civic attitudes. Peasant Party activists criticised local self-governments because of the excessive interference of administrative authorities. But self-government also had its good sides: elections, communal meetings, the struggle for democracy. The author emphasises that in this respect Scandinavian patterns were followed, and he stresses the role of such publicists as Maria Dąbrowska, Edward J. Abramowski and Juliusz Poniałowski. Speaking of negative phenomena, he mentions the use of self-government structures in political strifes.

Chapter III deals with the role played by celebrations of national anniversaries in the shaping of patriotic and civic attitudes. Writing about the Kościuszko Insurrection, Molenda does not mention that the painting masterpiece "The Raclawice Panorama" and Franciszek Wójcik's writings played a great role in this respect as early as 1894. He pays more attention to the January rising which was regarded as a pattern for a policy striving for independence. The National Democratic Party emphasised the peasants' negative role in 1863, while peasant activists stressed the peasants' participation in the rising. The peasants were more impressed by symbols and the artistic part of celebrations than by lectures. Molenda also mentions the anniversary of the Constitution of May 3rd, 1791, the anniversary of the battle of Grunwald celebrated in 1910, but says that not much attention was paid to the November rising. Speaking of positive heroes, he mentions first and foremost writers: Maria Konopnicka, Adam Mickiewicz and Juliusz Słowacki as well as a peasant-insurrectionist Bartosz Głowacki, who was even more respected than Kościuszko himself. Of course for reasons of censorship more celebrations took place in Galicia than in the Polish Kingdom. Peasant activists stressed that the nobility was responsible for the failure of the rising. They pointed out that the peasants in the Kingdom were granted land by the National Government in 1863, not by the tsarist government. It is difficult to say what influence these celebrations exerted on the peasants. They were attended

by many people, especially in Galicia, but not before the beginning of the 20th century. Alongside peasant activists, it was teachers and, to some extent, the clergy, who played the most active role in the organisation of these celebrations.

In Chapter IV the author writes about the popularisation of the idea of an independent democratic Poland among the peasants. The demand for independence did not appear in Galicia until the Polish Peasant Party (PSL) issued its programme in 1903; the demand was later put in stronger terms by Jan Dąbski and "Gazeta Ludowa". In 1913 the idea was adopted in the programmes of both the PSL "Piast" and the PSL *Lewica* (the Left). The slogan "Independent people's Poland" was generally accepted during the war. At first it was unification of Polish territories that was demanded; this was later changed to reconstruction of the state. An important role in this respect was played by the Sejm Circle's resolution put forward by Włodzimierz Tetmajer, a deputy of the PSL "Piast", on May 28, 1917; it was backed up by the PSL *Lewica* and the PSL of the Polish Kingdom.

During the war it was probably Jan Dąbski and "Gazeta Ludowa" that did most to propagate the idea that independent Poland would be a people's Poland. They emphasised the necessity of redressing social wrongs, demanded the political equality of all social classes without the predominance of the peasant class, and stressed that national solidarity was essential in the strivings for independence. They underlined the necessity of the peasants' active participation in civic work and of overcoming their passivity. But they also criticised some alliances of the peasant parties. This was done especially by "Zaranie", which censured the Galician PSL's alliance with the conservatives.

Peasants took an active part in mass national manifestations but no figures are available. The author holds the view that social consciousness of a common existence outpaced national consciousness, especially in Galicia. Party membership fluctuated at first, but in my opinion this was also the case during the interwar years. National consciousness was promoted not only by various parties but also by educational and socio-economic initiatives, especially in Prussian Poland.

The circulation of papers and the membership of peasant parties increased at the end of the war. The peasants' sad plight was the reason why they regarded any foreign occupation and administration as alien. This is why they participated in the work of political-national bodies and joined military organisations.

In explaining the necessity of agrarian reforms, the peasant parties emphasised national and political motives. The programmes of the peasant parties differed by the ceiling each of them set on the permissible size of landed property and by the problem of compensation. The demand for a land reform without compensation did not appear until the interwar period. The peasants wanted a land reform in the full majesty of the law. They differed over the size of new plots, some advocating plots of 56,000 sq m, others 84,000 sq m, still others as much as 168,000 sq m. According to the members of peasant parties, peasant economy was superior to large-farm economy. Land reform was to redress historical injustice and link the peasants with the independent state. The peasants objected to the plans for the nationalisation and leasing of land.

Chapter V discusses the Great War period, from defence of property to anti-occupation actions. The author points out that in 1915–1918 peasant actions against the occupier were more numerous than strikes and protests against easement. The peasants opposed forced recruitment for labour, excessive war contributions and confiscations. These actions increased during protests against the Brest peace, in February–March 1918.

The war ravaged villages and made it necessary to increase the employment of women because of the mobilisation and evacuation of men. The position of young people, especially of the age groups that were not drafted, grew. The economy was modernised to some extent, but there was also demoralisation.

The author considers the participation of peasants in paramilitary organisations before World War I. Only estimates can be given. In my opinion Molenda

overestimates the strength of Bartosz Teams, which developed mainly in eastern Galicia. He puts the number of peasants in the Riflemen's Union at 4,000.

It is not quite clear why the number of peasants in the Legions decreased. In November 1914 only 825 peasants, that is about 8 per cent of the Legions' total membership, served in the Legions; peasant participation increased later to 12.5 per cent, but this is much less than the number of peasants who belonged to paramilitary organisations before the war. The author disregards the fact that many peasants, especially in Galicia, were drafted into the regular Austrian army. The participation of peasants in the Polish Military Organisation was much higher, amounting to 50 per cent at the end of the war.

Molenda also discusses the participation of peasant party members and peasants in various political-national organisations. There were 17 such organisations, the most important being the Commission of Confederated Independence Parties (Polish abbreviation KSSN), the Supreme National Committee (NKN) and the Central National Committee (CKN). Members of peasant parties were in all of them, but rather on the central level and as regards territorial level, mainly in the Kielce and Lublin regions. They were also in the Provisional Council of State, the Council of State, the Polish Liquidation Commission and the People's Government in Lublin.

These bodies functioned in more than one partition zone but the author does not make comparisons for lack of adequate data. Peasant party leaders concluded agreements with various political groupings. In the Polish Kingdom they came to an understanding with the Polish Socialist Party and the Piłsudskites, in Galicia rather with the National Democratic Party. Consensus was reached on the necessity of a struggle for independence, but social demands were not given up.

In conclusion the author sums up his observations, pointing out that an important role in the process of turning peasants into citizens was played not only by the peasant movement but also by the Church, education, and emigrants who returned to Poland.

Molenda's valuable work is not free of errors or doubtful statements and editorial defects. There are too many repetitions, e.g. in the discussion of the role of Dąbski and Studnicki, and in polemics over peasant patriotism. It is irritating that frequently references are made in the text to another chapter. In discussing the significance of the January rising the author did not take into account the book by Jan Detko and Krzysztof Dunin-Wąsowicz *Co-participants in the National Cause* which discusses peasants' diaries from that time and the peasants' attitude to the 1863/64 rising. Although Leon Kruczkowski's book *Peacock Feathers* is not an historical source, it portrays an interesting picture of relations in Galician villages before World War I and the foundation of various paramilitary organisations. In my opinion, this is an interesting and truthful picture. Would it not have been worth while to mention it too?

Molenda's book is a permanent contribution to research on the development of national consciousness among peasants. This process became ever deeper and wider. It reached its apogee in the peasant resistance movement in the years of World War II.

Krzysztof Dunin-Wąsowicz

Werner Benecke, *Die Ostgebiete der Zweiten Polnischen Republik. Staatsmacht und öffentliche Ordnung in einer Minderheitenregion 1918-1939*, Böhlau Verlag, Köln Weimar 1999, S. XI + 321, Beiträge zur Geschichte Osteuropas, Band 29.

Das Buch von Werner Benecke ist aus mindestens ein paar Gründen bemerkenswert. Vor allem hat sich der Autor mutig eines sehr schweren und komplizierten Themas angenommen und war bestrebt, es allseitig auszuleuchten, indem er sich dabei viel Mühe gegeben hat. Er hat dies auf eine gelungene Art und Weise getan, dadurch daß er viel Neues einführt, was, wenn man in Betracht zieht, daß er

über die internen Angelegenheiten eines fremden Landes schreibt, keinswegs einfach war. Überdies ist die Arbeit von einer sachlichen und objektiven Betrachtungsweise des Themas gekennzeichnet. Wenn ein deutscher Autor über die polnische Geschichte schreibt, zählt das ganz besonders.

Die Dissertation ist an der Universität in Göttingen entstanden, im Seminar von Professor Manfred Hilde r m e i e r, allerdings aus der Inspiration und unter aktiver Anteilnahme von Professor Rudolf J a w o r s k i.

Bei der Vorbereitung seiner Arbeit benutzte der Autor umfangreiche und allseitige Quellen, vor allem polnische, was ihm das Stipendium des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Warschau ermöglicht hat. Im Archiv der Neuen Akten hat der Autor Einblick in Dokumente des Ministeriums für Glaubensbekenntnisse und Öffentliche Aufklärung, in Dokumente des Präsidiums des Ministerrats und der Gesellschaft für Ostgebietswache (*Towarzystwo Straży Kresowej*) gewonnen. Nicht minder wichtig war die eingehende Nutzung von Materialien, die seinerzeit von der Arbeitsgruppe von Professor Władysław Grabski gesammelt wurden, der in den dreißiger Jahren in den Ostgebieten soziologische Forschungen geführt hat und die nur im geringen Grade im wissenschaftlichen Umlauf präsent waren.

Wichtig war auch das Nutzen des Politischen Archivs des Auswärtigen Amtes sowie des Londoner Archivs *Society of Friends*, in dem sich einzigartige von Quäkern, die in den Ostgebieten (*Kresy*) humanitäre Hilfe leisteten, angefertigte Dokumente befinden.

Mit großer Sorgfalt verwertete der Autor auch alle zeitgenössischen gedruckten Quellen, indem er an sehr selten berücksichtigte Zeitschriften, wie die "Przegląd Mierniczy" (Messrundschau), "Głos Gminy Wiejskiej" (Die Stimme der Dorfgemeinde) oder die orthodoxe Zeitschrift "Voskresnoje Cztenije" gelangte. Sehr genau hat der Autor die Fachliteratur ausgewertet, in der Veröffentlichungen aus der Zwischenkriegszeit einen großen Teil ausmachen.

Zusammenfassend kann man sagen, daß die Quellenbasis der Dissertation sehr umfangreich ist. Der Verfasser hat viele Materialien gesammelt, auf deren Grundlage er den Versuch unternahm, die politische und soziale Geschichte der Ostgebiete in der Zeit, in der sie sich in den Grenzen der Zweiten Polnischen Republik befanden, darzustellen. Ist dies die vollständige, komplette Geschichte dieser Gebiete? Sicherlich nicht. Nichtsdestoweniger hat der Autor viele Angelegenheiten und Probleme hervorgehoben und dargestellt, die eine Vorstellung davon geben, wie das Leben in den Ostgebieten aussah, wie die polnische Macht auf diesem Gebiet ausgeübt wurde.

Strittig scheint jedoch die Festlegung des Territoriums zu sein, das der Autor als die Ostgebiete bezeichnet. Er nimmt an, daß es aus vier Wojewodschaften bestand: Wilna, Nowogródek, Polesien und Wolhynien. Er berücksichtigt hingegen nicht das Territorium des ehemaligen österreichischen Teilungsgebiets, der Wojewodschaften: Tarnopol, Stanisławów, teilweise Lemberg, die in der polnischen Fachliteratur auch zu den Ostgebieten (*Kresy*) gerechnet werden. Schließlich ist er selbst nicht sehr konsequent wenn er als Ostgebiete die bereits erwähnten vier Wojewodschaften definiert, denn er bespricht auch die Lage in der Wojewodschaft Lublin (das Chelmer Gebiet), die nicht zu den Ostgebieten gerechnet wird.

Es gibt Themen, die der Autor offensichtlich auslässt. Das Wilnaer Gebiet untersucht er lediglich unter dem Aspekt der belorussischen Angelegenheiten, bzw. der polnisch-belorussischen, ohne den polnisch-litauischen Aspekt zu berücksichtigen. Die farbige Beschreibung der Ostgebiete zu Beginn der zwanziger Jahre, die er schuf, würde sehr gut die Darstellung dessen, was sich in dem neutralen Streifen abspielte, der im polnisch-litauischen Grenzgebiet seit Ende 1920 bis zu den Anfängen 1923 existierte, ergänzen. Es fanden dort Ereignisse statt, die seine Ausführungen darüber bestätigen würden, daß die Ostgebiete viele Jahre lang eine Gegend bildeten, in der besondere Bedrohung existent war, in der besondere Sicherheitsmaßnahmen haben ergriffen werden müssen.

Es gibt noch andere Fragen, die in dem Buch nicht angeschnitten wurden. Der Autor schreibt nicht über die Städte in den Ostgebieten, was er allerdings im Vorwort betont. Man kann mit ihm übereinstimmen, daß das Dorf quantitativ in den Ostgebieten überwog und das wichtigste Element des Lebens dieser Region bildete. Es gab jedoch auch Städte, die eine bedeutende Rolle spielten. Mehr noch, angesichts ihrer Zusammensetzung und Tradition zeichneten sie sich durch ein eigentümliches Kolorit aus. Das Auslassen dieser Städte hat die Arbeit ärmer gemacht.

Es fehlt in dieser Arbeit ebenfalls, mag sein, daß dies die Folge des Auslassens der Städte ist, ein Kapitel, in dem das Leben und die Kultur der jüdischen Bevölkerung in den Ostgebieten besprochen worden wäre. Diese zeichnete sich durch eine Reihe einzigartiger Merkmale aus. Der Autor bespricht auch nicht in getrennter Form die polnische Bevölkerung in den Ostgebieten, ihre Hauptzentren, die soziale Zusammensetzung sowie die Rolle, die sie gespielt hat. An verschiedenen Stellen wird dieses Thema zwar erwähnt, das Problem wurde jedoch nicht völlig dargestellt.

All das bedeutet jedoch nicht, daß das in dem Buch dargestellte Bild der Ostgebiete wenig glaubwürdig ist. Im Gegenteil, der Autor hat, was wir bereits erwähnt haben, viel Neues und Wahres zu diesem Thema gesagt. Die ausgewählten Probleme stellt er eingehend dar, manche Angelegenheiten, die sich auf glaubwürdige Quellen stützen, untersucht er tiefgründig. Seine Beschreibung der Ostgebiete, die zwar die bereits genannten Lücken aufweist, liefert dem deutschen Leser viele Informationen, die er bisher weder in der deutschen Literatur zu diesem Thema noch in der angelsächsischen oder französischen finden konnte.

Nehmen wir uns als erstes die allgemeine Lage vor, insbesondere die gesellschaftlich-wirtschaftliche, die sich in den Ostgebieten nach dem I. Weltkrieg einstellte, nachdem diese Gebiete von den polnischen Behörden übernommen worden waren. Benecke hat in seiner Arbeit das Ausmaß der Verwüstungen, die der Krieg im Land verursachte, dargestellt, er schilderte die unaussprechlich schweren Lebensbedingungen, die einem großen Teil der Bevölkerung zuteil wurden. Dabei stützt er sich u. a. auf die Berichte der Mitglieder der *Society of Friends*, der berühmten Quäker, die zwar in begrenztem Maße, den Einheimischen aber doch Hilfe geleistet haben. Er schreibt über zerfallende, feuchte Erdhütten, in denen viele tausende Familien in der alten Frontzone lebten, er schreibt über die Ernährung, die Kleidung dieser Menschen, die sich erst allmählich und langsam besserten. Einen Anteil am Leben dieser Familien hatten auch die Quäker, die Pflugstaffeln bildeten, die für die Landwirtschaft Brachland zurückgewannen und Holztransporte für den Häuserbau organisierten.

Insgesamt finden wir in der Arbeit eine genaue Beschreibung der katastrophalen Lage, in der sich die Ostgebiete zu Beginn der polnischen Herrschaft befanden. Parallel zu dem wirtschaftlichen Ruin waren die Zwangsmigrationen der Bevölkerung, die große Ausmaße annahmen und bis in die Nachkriegsjahre hinein andauerten, eine ernsthafte Schwierigkeit bei der Wiederherstellung der Stabilität, die so wichtig für den Wiederaufbau der Wirtschaft war.

Eine anderes Hindernis war die mangelnde Sicherheit, die in der Zunahme der Kriminalität, in Überfällen bewaffneter Banden, die meistens aus Gegenden jenseits der östlichen Grenze eindringen, zum Ausdruck kam. In diesem Kontext stellt der Autor die Behauptung auf, mit der es zu übereinstimmen gilt, daß die Lage in den Ostgebieten in hohem Maße von der internationalen Lage Polens, von seinen Beziehungen mit der UdSSR und Deutschland abhängig war. In Anlehnung an Archive führt er sehr viele Beispiele und Fakten an, die davon zeugen, daß die deutsche Regierung den belorussischen und besonders den ukrainischen Irredentismus unterstützte oder manchmal gar inspirierte. Der Verfasser gibt genau die Höhe der Beträge an, die die ukrainischen Organisationen in Polen, u. a. für ihre Wahlkampagnen bekamen. Man hat das geahnt, die Zeitungen haben

auch darüber geschrieben, aber nun hat der Autor das so belegt, daß keine Zweifel mehr bestehen.

Schade, daß der Verfasser, indem er über die Irredentismusaktion schrieb, die bedeutende Rolle nicht erwähnte, die die litauische Regierung in diesem Bereich spielte, als sie die Rolle des Koordinators der Bemühungen der nationalen Minderheiten, die in Polen lebten, übernahm. In Kowno, auf Veranlassung des Außenministers Juozas Purickis, schmiedete man sogar Pläne, in Polen einen Aufstand aller nationalen Minderheiten zu organisieren. Es kam jedoch nie zur Verwirklichung diesartiger Ideen. Die Sache ist bekannt. Sie wurde in der polnischen und litauischen Fachliteratur beschrieben. Hier wäre sie eine wesentliche Ergänzung der Erwägungen des Autors.

In den weiteren Teilen des Buches schildert der Verfasser genau die Bemühungen der polnischen Behörden, die darauf abzielten, das Dorf strukturell umzugestalten, es zu modernisieren. Der Beschreibung der Bodenreform, ihrem Charakter und Umfang ist viel Platz gewidmet. Seines Erachtens war das Ziel der Reform, den Bauernwirtschaften infolge der Parzellierung der Gutshöfe ein vollwertiges landwirtschaftliches Profil zu verleihen, ohne jedoch die Grundlagen des Eigentumsrechts zu verletzen. Die Bodenreform war von der Kommissation von Bauerngrundstücken begleitet, da man, wie er betont, in der Zersplitterung den Grund für die Schwäche der Landwirtschaft sah. Nach Ansicht des Autors wurde die Kommissation in hohem Grade verwirklicht.

Getrennt bespricht der Verfasser der Arbeit die mit den Agrarangelegenheiten im Zusammenhang stehende Frage der militärischen Ansiedlung in den Ostgebieten. Benecke schreibt, daß die Ostgebiete einen strategischen Bereich der Sicherheit Polens, der von grundlegender Bedeutung war, bildeten. Da man der Loyalität der einheimischen Bevölkerung nicht sicher war, wollte man durch die Ansiedlung die Lage bessern. Eine gewisse Rolle spielte dabei auch das Streben nach der landwirtschaftlichen Aktivierung des dünn bevölkerten Landes. Das waren die Absichten, ihre Verwirklichung sah jedoch anders aus. Es haben sich zwar anfänglich 93 tausend Bereite gemeldet, was zusammen mit den Familien eine beträchtliche Zahl ausmachte, dann aber aufgrund verschiedener Ursachen wurden faktisch 7,3 tausend Familien angesiedelt, was eine zu kleine Zahl war, als daß sie einen bedeutenden Einfluß auf die Lage in den Ostgebieten hätte ausüben können. Die Ansiedlung hat hingegen viele Spannungen in den Beziehungen mit den Einheimischen ausgelöst. Im großen und ganzen war das eine mißlungene Aktion.

Viel schreibt der Autor auch über die polnische Verwaltung des Landes. Er unterzieht die Zusammensetzung, die Kompetenzen, die Arbeitsbedingungen der Beamten und Funktionäre einer genauen Analyse. Er schreibt, daß das Erbe, das die russische Teilungsmacht und der deutsche Besatzer in Gestalt von einer Unmenge von Gesetzen, Anordnungen und Vorschriften hinterlassen haben, von Anfang an viele Schwierigkeiten bereite. Man mußte sich provisorischer juristischer Lösungen bedienen und grundlegende rechtliche Regelungen haben Jahre gebraucht. Die Arbeitsbedingungen des Verwaltungsapparats waren in den Ostgebieten viel schlechter als im übrigen Polen: primitive Räume, schlechte Zufahrt, schlechtes Nachrichtenwesen. Die Gehälter der Beamten, die meistens junge Menschen waren, waren niedrig, sie gehörten zur niedrigsten Lohngruppe. Dies galt insbesondere für die Anfangsperiode.

Nichtsdestoweniger stellt der Autor die These auf, daß die Integration der Ostgebiete mit dem Rest der Republik in hohem Maße eben davon abhing, inwiefern es gelungen ist, ein leistungsfähiges Verwaltungsapparat zu schaffen und ihm Gestalt zu verleihen. Er gibt an, daß in den Ostgebieten, in Wojewodschaftsämtern und Starosteien etwa 8 tausend Beamte tätig waren. Überdies gab es 7,5 tausend Lehrer und 7,7 tausend Polizisten. 96% von ihnen waren Polen-Katholiken.

Das Justizapparat war weniger zahlreich. Die führende Gruppe bildeten 320 Richter, fast ausschließlich Absolventen der russischen Universitäten, die sehr

gut ausgebildet und deren juristischen Kenntnisse ausgezeichnet waren. Der Prozentsatz der Nichtpolen unter den Richtern betrug 14%, Nichtkatholiken (hauptsächlich Orthodoxe) 25%. Die Richter waren hochqualifiziert und hatten auch große Erfahrung. Die Auswahl dieser Menschen war, wie der Autor es betont, ein Beweis für die Sorge um das Niveau des Gerichtswesens.

Benecke zieht die Schlussfolgerung, daß es in verhältnismäßig kurzer Zeit gelungen ist, in den Ostgebieten ein Beamtenapparat aufzubauen, das mit dem, das in anderen Teilen Polens existierte, vergleichbar war. Die Sicherheitsfragen standen hier jedoch immer an erster Stelle, und dies sogar auf Kosten der anderen Dienste.

Indem der Autor über die Selbstverwaltung schreibt, betont er, daß sie in den Dienst des Staates eingespannt wurde; sie trieb Steuern ein, führte das Bevölkerungsverzeichnis, kümmerte sich um den Stand der öffentlichen Straßen. Die finanziellen Mittel, über die die Selbstverwaltung verfügte, waren unzureichend, verglichen mit dem Ausmaß der Aufgaben. Die finanziellen Schwierigkeiten wurden größer besonders in der Zeit der Wirtschaftskrise.

Der Autor widmet der Besprechung der Lage und der Probleme der orthodoxen Kirche in den Ostgebieten viel Platz. Die Zahl der Gläubigen in den 4 besprochenen Wojewodschaften betrug nach ihm 2587 tausend. Er erinnert an die meistens bekannte Tatsache, daß es den Behörden in erster Linie daran lag, die orthodoxe Kirche in Polen von der Oberherrschaft des Moskauer Patriarchats unabhängig zu machen, was auch gelungen ist. Die autokephale Kirche geriet jedoch in eine schwierige Lage. Während der zaristischen Herrschaft genoß sie vielseitige Unterstützung und Schutz seitens der Behörden. Seit 1915 hat sich ihre Lage geändert, da sie gezwungen war um ihre Einflüsse unter den Gläubigen zu kämpfen. Darüber hinaus wurde ihr Eigentum reduziert, von den 146 tausend Hektar Land, das die orthodoxe Kirche besaß, blieben ihr etwa 70 tausend Hektar übrig. Die katholische Kirche verlangte die Rückgabe von 500 Kirchengebäuden, die seinerzeit den Katholiken weggenommen wurden.

Ein Problem für die orthodoxe Kirche wurden Sekten, die ihre Gläubigen eben unter der orthodoxen Bevölkerung für sich zu gewinnen suchten. Im Kampf gegen diese Erscheinung haben die Würdenträger der orthodoxen Kirche begonnen, die Liturgie zu vervollkommen, den Kirchengesang schöner zu gestalten und andererseits fingen sie an, die Trunksucht aktiv zu bekämpfen, wodurch sie die Gläubigen für sich gewannen. Man schenkte auch der Ausbildung der Geistlichen sowie ihrer Kenntnis der Heiligen Schrift mehr Aufmerksamkeit.

Eine andere Bedrohung für den Zusammenhalt der orthodoxen Kirche war, nach Ansicht des Autors, die ukrainistische Strömung, die sich in der zweiten Hälfte der zwanziger Jahre in Wolhynien entwickelt hat, und deren Hauptforderung die Einführung der ukrainischen Sprache als der Sprache der Liturgie war. Bei der genauen Beschreibung dieses Problems weist der Verfasser der Arbeit auf zwei Angelegenheiten hin. Vor allem darauf, daß diese Strömung aus dem ehemaligen österreichischen Teilungsgebiet stammte und sich am stärksten in diesem Teil Wolhyniens entwickelte, der an Galizien grenzte. Gleichzeitig bemerkt er, daß die Anhänger der Ukrainisierung nur mäßige Erfolge erzielten. Weniger als 10% der Pfarreien in Wolhynien haben die ukrainische Sprache eingeführt. Dieselbe Aktion, die von den Belorussen unternommen wurde, endete mit einer völligen Niederlage. Nicht in eine einzige orthodoxe Kirche wurde das Belorussische eingeführt.

Im großen und ganzen ist der Autor der Meinung, daß sich die orthodoxe Kirche in den Ostgebieten sowie in ganz Polen, trotz der zahlreichen Erschütterungen, der neuen Situation angepaßt hat. Sie befand sich in einer unvergleichlich besseren Lage als die orthodoxe Kirche auf dem Territorium Sowjetrusslands.

Der Autor nimmt sich in seinen Erwägungen auch des Schulwesens an. Er betont die von den polnischen Behörden unternommenen Bemühungen, die darauf abzielten, das Grundschulwesen allgemein einzuführen. Detailliert be-

schreibt er materielle Schwierigkeiten (der Mangel an Gebäuden und Schulräumen) sowie psychologische (die häufige Abneigung der Eltern, Kinder in die Schule zu schicken), die man dabei überwinden mußte. Die Schulen in den Dörfern der Ostgebiete waren meistens in primitiven Zimmern untergebracht und das Schulpersonal bestand lediglich aus nur einem Lehrer. Nichtsdestoweniger war der Fortschritt enorm, verglichen mit russischen Zeiten.

In einem getrennten Kapitel schreibt der Autor über neue Erscheinungen, die in der Politik der polnischen Behörden in den Ostgebieten in der zweiten Hälfte der dreißiger Jahre zum Vorschein traten, wobei die Initiative und sogar ihre Leitung aus den Kreisen des Militärs kam. Die Aktion nannte man Revindikation.

Die erste war die Revindikation des niederen Adels, der in der Zeit der Teilungen seinen polnischen Charakter verloren hat, obwohl er gewisse Traditionen und das Gefühl der getrennten Identität gegenüber der ihn umgebenden Bevölkerung beibehalten hat. Seine Zahl betrug nach Ansicht des Autors 800–900 tausend. Er schätzt, daß die Anknüpfung an die adligen Traditionen damals kein seltsamer Anachronismus war. Die Vorstellung von der führenden Rolle des Adels war noch nicht erloschen. Die Zeit für diese Handlungen war jedoch kurz. Sie wurden durch den Krieg unterbrochen. Im Jahre 1939 zählte der Bund des Niederen Adels 40 tausend Mitglieder.

Anders bewertet Benecke eine andere Revindikation, und zwar die Versuche, die Orthodoxen im Chelmer Gebiet, denen diese Religion von den zaristischen Behörden aufgezwungen wurde, zum Katholizismus zu bekehren. Die quantitativen Effekte waren gering, obwohl drastische Methoden angewandt wurden, wie die Zerstörung von orthodoxen Kirchen, die der Autor entschieden verurteilt. Er schreibt, daß nichts dem Ruf Polens mehr schaden konnte als eben derartige Maßnahmen. Dies war die Schattenseite der polnischen Präsenz in den Ostgebieten.

Der Autor faßt seine Ausführungen zusammen und betont, daß die Politik der Polnischen Republik in den Ostgebieten, obwohl oft eine Improvisation, so mangelte es ihr jedoch nicht an einer allgemeinen Vorstellung. Es ging um die Beibehaltung der Unabhängigkeit und der territorialen Integrität der Zweiten Republik. Die Staatsverwaltung stellte sich selbst hohe Ansprüche, denen sie gerecht zu werden versuchte.

Mit dem Buch von Walter Benecke bekamen wir ein gut belegtes und tiefgründiges Studium. Der Autor vermochte es, die Lage in den Ostgebieten nicht nur eingehend und objektiv zu beschreiben, was wir vor Augen zu führen versucht haben, aber auch die vom polnischen Staat auf diesen Gebieten betriebene Politik zu bewerten und zu verstehen. Mehr noch, er wußte diese Anstrengung zu schätzen, die in der relativ kurzen Zeit der polnischen Herrschaft unternommen wurden, um die Ostgebiete in kultureller, sozialer und wirtschaftlicher Hinsicht aufzuwerten.

Piotr Łossowski

Iván T.[ibor] Berend, *Decades of Crisis: Central and Eastern Europe before World War II*. Berkeley — Los Angeles — London 1998, University of California Press, 437 pp.

This issue of "Acta Poloniae Historica" also carries my review of the previous book by Iván Berend, a former President of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, at present Professor of the University of California and until quite lately Chairman of the International Committee of Historical Sciences (C.I.S.H.)¹. His former book contained a historical outline of the last half century in Central-Eastern Europe from the end of World War II up to the recent years. His current work is also of a

¹ *Central-Eastern Europe as a Periphery of "Genuine Europe"?* (in connection with I. T. Berend's book: *Central and Eastern Europe 1944–1993. Detour from the Periphery to the Periphery*, Cambridge University Press 1996, 414 pp.).

general character and concerns an earlier period — from the beginning of the 20th c. up till 1939; the author discusses extensively the historical background reaching far back into the 19th c., and in his conclusion he outlines the history of the 1939–1945 war. He has a number of works devoted to this period behind him, in which, as an economist and economic historian, he has placed emphasis on the socio-structural aspect of development where he often seeks an explanation to political, ideological and artistic events. One should add that the region he is concerned with in the two books under review has long been the main area of his interests and numerous publications², so one can say that as a historian he is especially well prepared for writing synthetic works concerning Central-Eastern European countries³.

Due to the author's objective approach to his subject his previous book stands out from numerous "debunking" works on the recent history of Central Europe written of late in many countries. There is a great number of general works discussing the post-World War II history of this area, but syntheses of various kinds concerning the inter-war period are even more numerous. Thus Berend's current work faces a competition of, admittedly, frequently superficial works. In this situation the value of a synthetic approach depends primarily on two factors: the originality of concept and a thorough knowledge of the history of particular countries. The units the author deals with are mainly countries-states of Central-Eastern Europe using many very different languages, whose knowledge cannot be required of one author. In this situation he can hardly avoid making use of second-hand information which is frequently imprecise. General statements based on such a foundation may be superficial. The Polish reader will perceive in Berend's book some minor lapses concerning the history of our country. They are not worth mentioning, however, they testify to the difficulties that pile up before the writers of synthetic works on this region of Europe.

The author consistently adheres to the thesis which he developed in his book of 1996. What he has in mind is the theory of modernization, to which he links his exposition of social, economic and political changes in the countries of Central-Eastern Europe. Here one should emphasize that although in his previous book the author confined himself to Central-Eastern Europe, and strictly speaking to the "satellites" of the U.S.S.R. (also those which, like Yugoslavia or Albania, liberated themselves from dependence on this Great Power), he includes in the current book Russia/U.S.S.R. as well⁴. The author tries to explain the most important problem of the 20th c. in Europe, that is the origin of totalitarian and authoritarian movements and regimes, by the desperate attempts of countries and societies that were backward and peripheral (in comparison to the Western-European kernel, and naturally, to the developed overseas countries with the

² Many of them were published by the author jointly with Geörgy Ránki, such as: *Economic Development in East-Central Europe in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, Columbia University Press, New York 1974; *The European Periphery and Industrialization, 1780–1914*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1982 as well as chapters concerning South-Eastern Europe in *Handbuch der europäischen Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte* ed. by W. Fischer, Bd. 5, Klett-Cotta, Stuttgart 1985.

³ The book has three parts: the first one discusses the period until the end of World War I, the second — the decade 1918–1929, the third — the period 1929–1939. In the first part the author places emphasis on the specificity of our region from the point of view of modernization and on the rise of nationalist, communist and fascist ideologies. In the second he discusses nationalism in politics and economy as well as the rise of a communist system in Russia, in the third — social and economic results of the crisis and the rise of dictatorial regimes. Worthy of attention are two extensive chapters devoted to art, one before 1918, the other after this date.

⁴ The previous version of the book under review appeared in 1982 in Hungarian and had three editions. For linguistic reasons it is not known to me. Contrary to the current version, the previous one embraced Germany but excluded Russia and the Baltic countries. This fact by itself shows that we have to deal here with a new elaboration, which the author confirms in his preface (pp. XVII–XVIII).

U.S.A. at the head), to get out of this backwardness and to abolish the differences dividing them from the rich West⁵.

While presenting this question I must refer to its extensive discussion contained in my review of Berend's previous book, for similar remarks suggest themselves on reading the current synthesis. They can be put down to admitting that the part of the history of Central-Eastern Europe here under discussion cannot be explained by one cause. Even if the motive of emerging from backwardness and catching up with the leading countries and societies underlay all the departures from the "natural" (=liberal-democratic?) model of development in the rest of Europe, one cannot ignore the specific traits of the whole era, which roused to political life the masses who so far had only been the object of history. Anybody who wanted to achieve some major social and political goals had to appeal to those masses, and not only to the social elites, as before. The development of national societies in the 20th c. is bound up precisely with this question. The accelerated maturing of those societies in "peripheral" countries, signifying the inclusion of the wide masses of those more or less "backward" societies in the orbit of political concerns, had to lead to the prevalence of populist movements, based on common participation, and after the seizure of power even forcing their participation or at least its external symptoms. Unlike the West, public representation in these countries did not consist of a few, basic political movements, well-rooted in history and supported by a large percentage of the population who due to those movements felt involved in the political life of their countries. Here the masses, newly won over for politics and national life, could be organized only within the framework of populist movements.

This factor determined both the political forms existing in the inter-war period and the political programmes, which not only envisaged a leap to modernization but frequently also formulated nationalistic and imperialistic goals. In fact, both kinds of goals, modernization and nationalism, were not only independent, but could also, at any moment, come into conflict with one another when the underdeveloped socio-economic potential of the given society became the basis for its, both in the literal and figurative sense, costly expansion. The imperialistic concept, in countries where it was possible, e.g. in Germany or Italy, could combine both these goals in envisioning the construction of an empire where the conquered peoples would work for the metropolitan country and its sovereigns. However, this concept was developed on a larger scale only during World War II, while the movements and regimes in other, smaller countries did not have, even approximately, a sufficient potential for such designs; yet, the authoritarian propaganda willingly combined modernization with the realization of a nationalistic programme, indicating e.g. alien minorities or neighbouring nations as an obstacle to the reconstruction of the country, which was possible only in case of subordination of the whole society to the regime.

At any rate, in contrast to the fascist countries — Germany and Italy — in Central-Eastern Europe there were no strong mass movements directed by new, populist rightist élites. The élites in power, generally derived from the traditional ruling classes, did not succeed in creating mass movements for they could not propose any populist-revolutionary watchwords to the wider ranks of population: they were mainly intent on retaining the power and the social position of traditional élites. This was the situation in all but one country of Central-Eastern Europe after the collapse of the democratic-parliamentary institutions. In this situation the authoritarian regimes had no chance to speed up modernization and gain mass support.

At any rate, the theory of modernization does not seem to be a sufficient explanation of the complicated problems in our region of Europe. I have written

⁵ "The various revolts and modernization attempts in Central and Eastern Europe, whether nationalist, right-wing, or left-wing, all deformed into dictatorships — Nazi, royal, presidential, military, and Stalinist — during the 1930s." (p. 357).

about it in my previous review, and expressed a conviction that only a juxtaposition of transformations occurring in Central–Eastern Europe over the whole era, from the 19th c. up to recent years, could be a basis for profound deliberations on the source of these transformations. Now, after the author has published his book, which, together with the previous one, discusses the history of the last 100–150 years, one should expect a new treatment of his theses. It is a pity that in his present book he does not mention the one published in 1996.

As in other works by Berend, the strong point of this book is his presentation of economic and social problems. He says a lot about the economy of peripheral countries, a problem to which he previously devoted some serious studies. Worthy of note are data that enable us to estimate the backwardness of the European East in relation to the West and indicate the gap between them, growing during the 19th c. (pp. 3–22). Even in the best period of modernization and industrialization, i.e. between 1860–1910, the growth of the national product in Eastern and Central–Eastern Europe was lower than in the West, and even then the gap between them was growing. The great crisis of the 1920s–1930s additionally aggravated the peripheral character of our region, especially of its economy. Worthy of note are also more precise data on the otherwise well-known disproportions in the ethnico–economic structure in Central–Eastern Europe (pp. 24–47).

I have mentioned above (note 3) the internal structure of this book and I do not want to discuss systematically its successive chapters, especially because the events presented synthetically in it are generally well-known to historians. I will confine myself to noting some of the author's opinions. Among them I must cite his thesis that after 1918 there was no chance for a parliamentary democracy in the countries of the region in question⁶. Although it would be naive to say, as some historians do, that prosperity directly depends on democracy (were there no cases of a society's wealth under a dictatorial system?), one can hardly imagine in the modern world a well-functioning democratic system based on poverty and primitivism of existence of the majority of population. No wonder that, except for the Czech Republic and very short periods elsewhere, parliaments happened to be a mere decoration, and citizens' rights, including the guarantees for ethnic minorities, remained on paper only, etc. etc. Neither the wide ranks of society, nor the political élites constituted in those countries a base of democracy, regardless of the officially voiced watchwords, adjusted, it is true, to the preponderance of the Western Powers in the world at that time, especially after 1918. In the countries of Central–Eastern Europe of greatest consequence was the old-fashioned patriarchal, and partly authoritarian and anti-democratic attitude of rightist groupings, as well as the relative weakness of democratic socialism, which on the Left was frequently ousted by communism. If we add to this the combatant factor, so important after 1918, which generally took the side of nationalist authoritarianism, or at least had an authoritarian orientation — the question arises who was in fact to introduce democracy in this region, especially under the conditions of post-war economy, and soon in face of the great crisis and an economic depression that devastated everything. In this case Berend seems to be right in saying that authoritarian structures were characteristic of the situation in this region at that time.

Worthy of attention is what the author writes about the mutual relation between fascism and other nationalist and counter-revolutionary trends in Central–Eastern Europe. Although he quotes Karol Polanyi's⁷ warning against confusing nationalism and authoritarianism with fascism, he emphasizes that

⁶ "The historical alternative to Bolshevik and populist dictatorships in postwar Central and Eastern Europe was not Western-type democracy but «white» terror and conservative autocracy" (p. 139).

⁷ Karol Polanyi, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, Boston 1964 Beacon Press.

these different political currents had a common background, i.e. economic backwardness and an archaic social structure as well as the earlier unfinished nation-creative process (p. 201). Finally, however, (pp. 340-345) he emphasizes the most important thing: in the inter-war period the authoritarian regimes in Central-Eastern Europe were marked above all by a conservative attitude to modernization and a counter-revolutionary character, and feared both a revolution from the Left and being unseated by their fascist competitors. Such a picture emerged in almost all the countries of this region and this was a serious obstacle to the seizure of power by the fascist elements. Even during World War II this conflict continued among the ruling circles of Hitler's satellite states, as we learn from the examples of Rumania and Hungary. One should agree with the author on this question too.

The description of transformations which occurred in Russia/U.S.S.R. following 1918 up to World War II is rather overshadowed by the author's tendency to explain everything by means of the theory of modernization. Consequently, this separate history of the communist empire has been pressed into successive chronological chapters. This is, however, of less consequence than the defective and fragmentary explanation of complicated historic processes by "modernization", although Russia's peripheral situation and socio-economic backwardness certainly lay at the root of the revolution, and later — the concept of "construction of socialism in one country", promoted by Stalin. Apart from that the author sometimes presents various theses on controversial problems of the history of this period, without taking a stand himself, as e.g. when he attempts to explain the essence and rational core of Stalin's purges (pp. 352-353). On the other hand worthy of emphasis is his remark that millions of the persecuted and murdered in Stalin's purges had their counterpart in millions (admittedly, not so many) of those promoted to the recently vacated posts. Otherwise this bloody machinery would not be able to function, since no authority can do without a minimum of support, and not by individuals, but at least by some milleus, groups and social strata⁸.

Polish historians will be especially interested in the picture and place of Poland in this book. I have mentioned some lapses, nevertheless the main lines of Polish history, always presented against the background of the whole region, have been outlined properly. In his bibliography the author cites a few Polish works. There are no revelations; Berend seems to know more thoroughly the meanders of history of South-Eastern European countries, be it merely because of his previous works. We are struck by his remark that the plans for any multi-national structures in the territory under discussion (i.e. Central-Eastern Europe, without the Eastern Russian-Soviet empire) have failed completely, even if these structures were initially given state forms. Contemporary events corroborate this thesis. We mention it only because this background throws even more sharply into relief the anachronism and hopelessness of Polish supra-national Eastern plans (including Piłsudski's Eastern policy), invoking pre-partition concepts and conditions (pp. 148-149)⁹.

Finally, a few words about two chapters devoted to art. One is entitled *Revolution in Art and the Art in Revolution* and deals with the pre-war period and the years directly following 1918, and the second *The Art of Crisis and the Crisis in Art*, which obviously refers to the later phenomena, including "totalitarian" art. This gives us an idea of the point of view adopted by the author who mainly

⁸ "This Stalin phenomenon would be unrealisable without both the ruthless oppression and successful modernization that uprooted and massacred millions but elevated other millions" (pp. 348-349). Let us add, however, that the phenomenon in question was a special kind of modernization with aims that were primarily military-impertalist, and not social, and in the second place referred to the not yet old-fashioned but already not up-to-date technological patterns.

⁹ Berend also mentions Paderewski's formula from his letter to Wilson, where he used the expression "the United States of Poland" (p. 148).

focuses on the relations of art to ideology and politics. These chapters are very valuable if one remembers that they were written with such an optics, and moreover that art is here somewhat isolated from other phenomena of culture, such as e.g. the education or school system. One should certainly appreciate this extension of his synthesis beyond political and economic history.

The book under review and Berend's previous work in many respects make up a whole, especially because of his way of explaining the specific history of our region in Europe. His current synthesis, embracing the 20th c. up to World War II, and extensively referring to earlier times, has its stronger and weaker sides. It is affected by the author's previous interests and achievements, however, generally speaking it meets the basic demands of a general work, supported by the well-known historian's erudition and investigative effort.

Janusz Żarnowski