

REVIEWS

Acta Poloniae Historica
122, 2020
PL ISSN 0001-6829

Hans-Jürgen Bömelburg and Norbert Kersken (eds), *Mehrsprachigkeit in Ostmitteleuropa (1400–1700). Kommunikative Praktiken und Verfahren in gemischtsprachigen Städten und Verbänden*, Marburg, 2020, Verlag Herder-Institut, VI+245 pp., indices, ills; series: Tagungen zur Ostmitteleuropaforschung, 37

The question of what the common denominator may have been for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Bohemian Crown countries, on the one hand, and the cities of Cracow, Lwów, Gdańsk (Danzig), Poznań, and Toruń (Thorn), on the other, can be answered in several different ways. Apart from the apparent geographical criterion, which first comes to mind, assigning the above-listed places to East Central Europe, finding more ‘contact points’ can prove a more laborious task. However, the multi-author book published in the first half of 2020 by Verlag Herder-Institut of Marburg is pretty helpful in this respect. Its core title, *Mehrsprachigkeit in Ostmitteleuropa (1400–1700)*, points to multilingualism not only as a keynote of the articles included in the volume but, primarily, as a phenomenon that was characteristic of East Central European lands over several centuries. Thus, the anthology forms part of a recent trend of researching the European continent through the prism of multilingualism – just to mention the studies edited by Michael Baldzuhn and Christine Putzo, Christiane Maaß and Annett Volmer, or penned by Peter Burke.¹ Hans-Jürgen Bömelburg from Gießen and Norbert Kersken from Marburg, the historians substantively supervising the project, specialising in the region’s history (their respective areas of interest being the early modern age, with particular focus on Poland, and the Middle Ages), refer in the subtitle – *Kommunikative Praktiken und Verfahren in gemischtsprachigen Städten und Verbänden* – to the balance points around which the contributed studies focus: the communication practices and procedures present in cities as well as in associations or societies (as a broad concept: institutions, blended elites, etc.). The two photographs featured on the front cover, evoking pages from the Latin-German-Polish *Dictionarium Trium linguarum* (Kraków–Scharfenberg

¹ Michael Baldzuhn and Christine Putzo (eds), *Mehrsprachigkeit im Mittelalter: Kulturelle, literarische, sprachliche und didaktische Konstellationen in europäischer Perspektive. Mit Fallstudien zu den ‘Disticha Catonis’* (Berlin, 2011); Christiane Maaß and Annett Volmer (eds), *Mehrsprachigkeit in der Renaissance* (Heidelberg, 2005); Peter Burke, *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2004).

1528), ideally correspond with the title and suggest that same three languages have been the contributors' focus.

The book opens with a table of contents ('Inhalt', pp. V–VI), guiding to the content's layout and the names of the authors. Those affiliated with Polish universities or scholarly institutions prevail (9); the other scholars are from Germany (3), Czech Republic and Ukraine (one each) – as specified on the final page ('Autorinnen und Autoren', p. 245). Apart from two articles in English, all the others are written in German.

An extensive introduction by Hans-Jürgen Bömelburg and Thomas Daiber (Gießen), entitled 'Mehrsprachigkeit in Ostmitteleuropa. Einsichten und Forschungsfragen zu einem interdisziplinären Forschungsfeld' (pp. 1–24), points, in the initial paragraph, to the need to place late medieval and early modern multilingualism appearing in East Central Europe in the general European context, and to elaborate on the phenomenon in trans- and interdisciplinary terms, through research in sociolinguistics, contact linguistics, philology, history, and cultural studies (p. 1). The text is divided into seven numbered sections, the first offering initial considerations on multilingualism and language awareness ('Theoretische Vorüberlegung: Mehrsprachigkeit und Sprachbewußtsein', pp. 1–11), also pointing to intensified interest in the issue. One reason might be the language policy pursued by the European Union, which postulates the trilingual model, along with the current migration situation, which implies multilingualism (p. 1). Part two ('Forschung zu Mehrsprachigkeit im östlichen Europa', pp. 11–12) indicates the basic purpose behind the publication, which is to disseminate the most recent research findings in the field of historical multilingualism in East (Central) Europe and to make a broader audience acquainted with them, thereby enabling comparative studies against the general European background (p. 11). The leading idea that has inspired the project aptly assumes that the findings regarding East Central Europe in the late Middle Ages and early medieval period are relevant in many respects to such comparative studies.

The authors point to the region in question as a peculiar area where languages connected to the Eastern and Western Europe and to the Mediterranean exchanged and intermingled in the period between 1300 and 1700 (p. 12). In this context, the dates 1400 to 1700 featured in the title do not entirely reflect this chronological framework, especially that the article following the introduction largely analyses fourteenth-century records. Section three ('Mehrsprachigkeit im östlichen Europa – eine besondere Gemengelage', pp. 12–13) focuses on a concise presentation of the conditions benefiting the development of multilingualism in the area under research, the starting point being no dominance of the Latin culture of writing and literary activity, otherwise so characteristic of Western Europe. Part four ('Der historische Ort Ostmitteleuropas', pp. 14–18) specifies the geographic area being of interest to the project initiators, encompassing the lands of the Bohemian Crown, Poland,

and the historical Grand Duchy of Lithuania (p. 14). Moreover, the language situation in the individual parts of the region is elucidated. The fifth section of the introduction ('Akkulturation, Assimilation, Mehrsprachigkeit und Sprachwechsel', pp. 19–20) deals with the processes of acculturation and assimilation, characteristic of East Central Europe in the period concerned, in the context of multilingualism and change of the language in use. The sixth point ('Forschungsstand und forschungsleitende Fragen', pp. 20–1) presents a modest and quite fragmentary state of research (with respect to the period 1300–1700, again), stressing the need to shed new light on the phenomenon under consideration. The need is aptly emphasised to glance at language learning processes as basically reversible, incomplete, and unfinished, an aspect that is often neglected in the context of historical research and incomplete source materials (otherwise, the postulate is obvious from a glottodidactic perspective; p. 21). Point seven ('Zu den vorliegenden Beiträgen', pp. 21–4) concisely discusses the articles comprised in the volume. The editors have arranged them systematically by chronology (p. 21), setting five subject areas. They have regrettably not been reflected in the titles of the chapters, which would have made the book's structure conceptually even more transparent. Let us add that the sequence of the texts discussed under subject area number four (p. 23) is the only one that does not correspond with the order as per the table of contents (2, 3, 4, 1), which might be an error in the latter. The introduction's last paragraph remarks that the articles were originally compiled in the aftermath of a conference held on 22–24 November 2012 in Marburg, as also testified by the title of the publication series (Tagungen zur Ostmitteleuropaforschung). The book is dedicated to the memory of Witold Szczuczko, an archivist from Toruń, who passed away on the first day of the said conference (p. 24).

Late medieval historiographic reflection is the first of the proposed subject areas; linguistic differences and (broadly identified) instances of foreignness are discussed as part of it (p. 21). Assigned to this section has been Vlastimil Brom's (Brno) article 'Die Sprachen in den böhmischen Ländern. Diskurse und Reflexion in der spätmittelalterlichen Historiografie' (pp. 25–45), primarily penetrating the works of late medieval Bohemian annalistic writing, just to mention the famous *Chronicle of Dalimil*. Instead of employing the prism (already known to scholars) of a xenophobic way of thinking, justified in terms of language and culture (p. 21), the proposed analysis is based upon the passages that discuss the perception of use of the language(s) and express the chronicler's own position in this respect (p. 25). This clearly-set goal leads to convincing conclusions that point to a multitude of such fragments, which, however, were selectively treated by the historiographers. This was due (among other things) to ideological premises, the methodological background, the intended effect, and the competencies of the authors, or translators (p. 45). Fragments of this sort usually did not form the core issues from the narrative's standpoint – albeit, as Brom emphasises, the description

of linguistic competences of Emperor Charles IV of Luxembourg (p. 45), who reportedly had a command of Czech, German, Latin, French, Lombardian and Tuscan (p. 42), ranks among the unique moments of this kind.

The second subject area, entitled 'Mehrsprachige Städte und kommunale Institutionen' (p. 22), includes four texts describing the multilingualism in four late medieval and early modern densely populated cities where several, two to five, languages coexisted. In his article "'... den wisch ufsteken". Zu deutschsprachigen und lateinischen Eintragungen im Krakauer Schöppenbuch in den ersten Jahren des 14. Jahrhunderts – Differenzen und Kontinuitäten' (pp. 47–61), Paul-M. Langner from Cracow (erroneously referred to in the volume as 'Martin-M.') explores the multilingualism of entries made in the Cracow aldermen's register in the years 1300–12. The author shows aspects of multilingualism within the period's juridical language as a specific paradigm interpreting the local community and seeks to identify their position amidst the experiences of a medieval man living in urban areas of the northern part of Europe (p. 48). The scholar expertly demonstrates that domination of entries made in German, Latin coming second, ended the moment Duke Ladislaus the Elbow-High (Władysław Łokietek) suppressed the rebellion of Albert, Mayor of Cracow, in 1312 (pp. 53–4). He also stresses the supreme role of the period's social bonds based on the sense of identification with the city, guild, parish, or fraternity, rather than those stemming from a shared language (p. 57). An appendix to the article (pp. 58–61) lists the councillors of Cracow and aldermen from the period concerned (1300–12). Zdzisław Noga (Cracow) addresses other aspects of multilingualism among Cracow burgher elite: his 'Mehrsprachigkeit im Krakauer Stadtrat im späten 15. und 16. Jahrhundert' (pp. 63–71) deals with the period between the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, being the one when Polish gradually gained in importance, both in trade contacts and in the official/clerical space, and specifies the reasons for which foreigners arriving in Cracow learned Polish. Their command of Polish, as Noga aptly remarks, depended on the circle or milieu they were associated with, on how long they stayed in the city, and on the character of their professional activity with the administrative bodies (p. 70). Among the reasons why German-speaking burghers intensively learned the local language was, certainly, their willingness to obtain Polish knighthood with its privileges; they basically placed a bet on a 'flee' from the burgher class, which was gradually deprived of political rights (p. 70).

In 'Language, Culture, and Ethnicity in Lviv (Lwów, Lemberg) from the Fourteenth to the Eighteenth Century' (pp. 73–87), Myron Kapral of Lviv describes the multilingualism in Lwów and how it transformed over the five centuries, in a city that attracted a variety of ethnic and religious groups due to the major trade routes intersecting in the area. "No single language could ever function as an absolute tool of cultural and linguistic unification" (p. 86), the scholar observes. Giving grounds for this statement, he notes that

the German language, which prevailed since the mid-fourteenth century as a language of communication among the local elites, was from the sixteenth century onwards gradually dominated by Latin and Polish, both used in the space of the sacred as well. The duality of sacred and vernacular languages – Church Slavonic and the autochthonic Ruthenian – contributed moreover to the city's everyday linguistic reality, along with Grabar and Kipchak as the languages of Armenian peddlers, while local Jewish communities spoke Hebrew and Yiddish. At last, Turkish and German enjoyed the status of international languages of trade (p. 87). The subject area's last article, 'Wer benötigte einen Dolmetscher im spätmittelalterlichen Lemberg? Sprachen und Kommunikation in einer multiethnischen Stadt' (pp. 89–107), is authored by Andrzej Janeczek of Warsaw, and zooms in on the multilingual situation of late medieval Lwów in respect of the then-numerous interpreters whose names were specified between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries in the municipal registers. The article primarily discusses how the city's residents communicated in daily life situations, official as well as private ones (p. 91). The author remarks that there were no communication problems among the dwellers of this multiethnic city, and convincingly explains the phenomenon in terms of acculturation and bilingualism processes (p. 105). He also emphasises the strategic role of municipal interpreters, mostly of Armenian descent, who (be it in the field of business) functioned as a bridge between the local speakers of Slavonic and Turkic languages (pp. 98–104).

The third subject area specified by the editors deals with the specificity of selected multilingual spaces (p. 23) and contains two articles. 'Institutionen, Identität und Gerichtsbarkeit im mehrsprachigen Wandel: Gemengesituationen und Übersetzungsvorgänge ostslawischer, polnischer und deutscher Sprache und Schriftlichkeitspraktiken im Großfürstentum Litauen' (pp. 109–25) by Stefan Rohdewald (Gießen) focuses on multilingual chancelleries operating in Grand Duchy of Lithuania's towns and using Ruthenian, Polish, and Latin languages. The special focus is the areas whose residents – Orthodox Christian, Uniate, or Catholic – being speakers of East Slavonic, that is, Ruthenian, took over, from the late medieval period onwards, the linguistic forms specific to West Slavonic, that is, Polish. This fascinating process manifested itself, among other aspects, in writing down single phrases or sentences from one of these languages using the alphabet of the other (pp. 110, 123). As clearly declared by the scholar, he seeks to describe the urban/municipal communication contexts (based on the examples of Połock and Smolensk), present multilingualism in the areas concerned as a central factor of institutional and social change, demonstrate the changes in the language practice typical of aristocratic circles in the context of noble identity, and indicate early modern linguistic transformations in the area of the judiciary (p. 110). The article moreover depicts the gradual spread of Polish as an official language from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century.

'Mehrsprachigkeit am polnischen Wasahof (1587–1668)', written by Hans-Jürgen Bömelburg (pp. 127–44), focuses (according to the author's clear declaration) on multilingualism in a monarch's circle – an issue rarely addressed by scholars – and is a case study of the Polish-Swedish Vasa court, whose members shaped the election monarchy in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and, thereby, in the East Central European area, over three generations (p. 127). The point-of-reference for the author is the monumental, four-volume study by Walter Leitsch, *Das Leben am Hof König Sigismunds III. von Polen* (Wien–Kraków, 2009). Bömelburg points to at least five languages having been actively used at the court, and to a gradual drifting away from German, the language prevalent in Sigismund III's time, toward French, which took prevalence under John II Casimir. A good command of the language that was dominant at the given time was the necessary condition for those aspiring to climb up the ladder of court career. The multilingualism of members of the House of Vasa on the Polish throne stemmed, as the author convincingly argues in conclusion, from the multilingual character of the Commonwealth, which posed high linguistic requirements for the central administration and the monarchs themselves; such a state of affairs allowed to satisfactorily represent the cultural diversity of this East Central European country (p. 144). For the sake of meticulousness, let us mention that the first two paragraphs on p. 131 contain a minor flaw: Ladislaus/Władysław IV is twice erroneously referred to as Sigismund/Zygmunt).

The fourth subject area, dealing with the pragmatics of language acquisition in Poland-Lithuania (p. 23), offers texts by four scholars, the first being Edmund Kizik's (Gdańsk) article 'Von Nicolaus Volckmar (?–1601) bis Johann Moneta (1659–1735). Danziger Sprachlehrbücher in der frühen Neuzeit' (pp. 145–61) – a review of four German-Polish phrasebooks and language-learning textbooks, repeatedly re-edited and published in Danzig/Gdańsk: *Vierzig Dialogi* by Nicolaus Volckmar (1612), *Kleiner Lustgarten* by Johann Carl Woyna (1693), *Enchiridion Polonicum* by Johann Moneta (1720), and *Zierlich polnische Send-Schreiben* by Alexander Schwertner (1692). For one thing, their essential importance for proper understanding of source texts, formalised and private, is emphasised; for another, their informative role, enabling one to explore the thorny issue of German-Polish daily relations in the early modern period, is aptly stressed (p. 159). The article is enriched with several illustrations showing the title pages of the works in question and with an appendix containing bilingual quotations from the Moneta book.

Camilla Badstübner-Kizik (Poznań) in her study 'Sprachen lernen unterwegs. Grand Tour und Mehrsprachigkeit am Beispiel der Bildungsreise von Jan Ługowski (1639–1643)' (pp. 163–83) seeks to interpret, based on the achievements of modern glottodidactics, the letters, travel accounts and notebooks documenting the education of a young nobleman, Jan Ługowski, in the languages during his educative journey across seventeenth-century

Europe (p. 164). The author vividly describes the stages of acquiring linguistic competences in the Polish, Latin, German, and Italian languages by the young man. She tentatively ascertains that young East Central European noblemen who have completed their educative journeys (which were criticised among experts since as early as the 1580s) are classifiable, in terms of today's glottodidactic conceptions, as multilingual (pp. 179, 181). An appendix features a photograph of Jan's letter, written in German, to his father (with a transcription) and quotes from letters, in Polish, exchanged between the young nobleman's custodian and Jan's father.

In her article "Viele Fremdsprachen kennen ist ein Geschenk Gottes". Empfehlungen für das Sprachenlernen in den polnischen Schriften des 17. Jahrhunderts' (pp. 185–94), Dorota Żołędz-Strzelczyk (Poznań) makes the reader acquainted with the views on teaching foreign languages expressed in the writings of Sebastian Petrycy, philosopher, historian, physician, poet, translator, and professor with the Cracow Academy, and in the pedagogical guidelines of Jakub Sobieski, magnate, parliamentarian, Marshal of the Sejm, diarist, and father of King John III Sobieski. Analysing the works written in the late sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, the scholar rightly argues that both Petrycy and Sobieski stressed the utilitarian importance of knowledge of languages, including modern ones, their spoken and written command ranking among the attributes of the educated man (pp. 193–4).

Michał Nowicki's (Poznań) 'Multilingual Education in Poznań Secondary Schools from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century' (pp. 195–206) discusses the activities of the famous Lubrański Academy (Collegium Lubranscianum) in Poznań, and of the local Jesuit College, between the sixteenth and the eighteenth centuries, based on (among others) their respective statutes and *catalogi lectionum*. The author stresses that Polish and Greek were permanently present in the curricula, with the leading position of Latin, of course. It was only in the latter half of the eighteenth century that teaching modern languages, such as French and, to a lesser degree, German, gained importance (pp. 205, 206) – which is perhaps somewhat astonishing, given the mainly German-speaking borderland area concerned.

The fifth, and last, subject area (composed of two contributions), deals with multilingualism of East Central Europe from the standpoint of cultural practices and linguistic reflection observable in the Royal Prussia territory (p. 23). The article 'Probleme der Mehrsprachigkeit bei Martin Gruneweg' (pp. 207–19) by Bogusław Dybaś (Toruń/Vienna) evokes the figure of Martin Gruneweg from Danzig/Gdańsk (1562–1618). A linguistically gifted man, who later on converted to Catholicism and became a Dominican friar, Martin was brought up in a bilingual environment of German and Polish; then, as an assistant to Warsaw and Lwów merchants, he traversed East Central and Southern Europe. With his command of Latin, Ruthenian, and Italian, Gruneweg finally decided to write down his memoirs in German,

treating it as an exercise to refresh his linguistic skills. The observations and findings recorded by him refer, among other things, to the linguistic competences of the others and of himself, including the mastering of foreign languages (p. 210). Moreover, they extend to etymological reflections, which are naïve from today's perspective (pp. 214–15). Dybaś rightly emphasises the essential importance of this fascinating source in learning about the actual early modern circumstances and methods or ways of using multiple languages across a geographically extensive territory whose limits were set by Gruneweg's vicissitudes (pp. 218–19).

The second, and last in the section, article, entitled “‘Herr, öffne meine Lippen’ – Selbsterkennen und Erwachsenwerden mittels der Sprache in der *Preussischen Kirchen=Historia* Christoph Hartknochs (1644–1687)’ (pp. 221–34), is written by Anna Mikołajewska (Toruń). Having explored the famous work by the Thorn-based professor Christoph Hartknoch, *Preussische Kirchen=Historia* (1686), the scholar discusses her reflection on the importance of language for community and in the identity-building process (p. 221), and offers a somewhat different conception of bilingualism. With the use of accurately selected examples, the author argues that for Hartknoch, there exists, on the one hand, a language of nature and sequence of events, which is heard in the history of inhabitants of Prussia, for example. It is through such a history that God communicates His plans to man, rewarding him for good deeds and punishing him for acts of misdemeanour. On the other hand, Hartknoch indicates the human need to be instructed in respect of the God's law in a comprehensible language of daily communication, one that builds the sense of community (p. 234). For a hymnologist, the fact is interesting that for Hartknoch, the incarnation of the latter aspect of language was the Pomesanian bishop Paul Speratus, one of the fathers of German hymn (p. 237).

The book concludes with two indices (helpful as they are in any historical publication): a multilingual index of places ('Ortsregister', pp. 235–7) and persons ('Personenregister', pp. 238–44), along with the aforementioned list of authors ('Autorinnen und Autoren', p. 245), which however contains no short notes on their research interests (the editors' fields of interest are briefly noted on the back cover).

To sum up, let us remark that the editors and contributing authors have managed, to a considerable degree, to fill the research gap through making available, within a single volume, the outcome of the most recent studies on multilingualism in East Central Europe between the late medieval and early modern period, and to gather the recently published relevant literature (access to the latter would undoubtedly be facilitated had the reference literature been listed below each of the articles). The texts are highly interesting, though some lack a clearly formulated research objective. Transferring the task to the reader, some of the authors may unintentionally trigger in the reader a sense of discomfort due to uncertainty as to where the argument actually goes. Despite

minor defects and subjective critical remarks, we have to do, all in all, with an extremely demanded and very successful publication, emphasising and promoting a trans- and interdisciplinary approach toward multilingualism. The book will certainly become an important point-of-reference particularly for scholars specialising in the history of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, including historians, literary scholars, linguists, culture experts, and/or pedagogues; and it is primarily them who should consider making the book under review part of their book collections.

transl. *Tristan Korecki*

Piotr Kociumbas

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9027-5953>

Jan K. Ostrowski, *Portret w dawnej Polsce* [Portrait in Early Poland], Warszawa, 2019, Muzeum Pałacu Króla Jana III w Wilanowie, 495 pp., 589 ill

I should like to remark at the very outset that the comments below come from a historian who deals with the modern era, without specialist competence in the history of art – as otherwise successfully pursued by the author of the study in question. This review is justified, however, by the conviction that the book by Jan K. Ostrowski, a long-standing director of the Royal Castle of Wawel and Professor at the Jagiellonian University [UJ] is a research achievement of importance to art historians and, to no lesser degree, to historians-as-such (without a specification label).

Following a good academic tradition, the study is founded upon a cycle of monographic lectures delivered for the students of the history of art at the UJ. Rather than a collection of studies on the art of portrait, the book is a monographic study with a well thought-over and clear structure – probably, the first such monograph since Tadeusz Dobrowolski's *Polskie malarstwo portretowe. Ze studiów nad sztuką epoki sarmatyzmu* [Polish Portrait Painting. Studies on the Art of the Sarmatian Age] (Kraków, 1948), published by the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences.

The book has been released by the Museum of King Jan III's Palace at Wilanów, in a large format (A4), making the reading somewhat difficult, with a very neat cover (featuring on its front the excellent portrait of Adam Kazanowski painted by Peeter Danckers de Rij, which is regrettably not specified). The publisher has also taken care about a decent typographic design of the book's inside, in the challenging two-column layout, meticulously edited text, and high-class paper; as a result, a legible print and good quality of numerous illustrations have been produced.

The book's laconic title clearly points to the object of the author's interest: rather than Polish portraits, the focus is on portraits in Poland or, to be more

specific, in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth's territory, in quite a *longue durée* – between the Middle Ages and the nineteenth, if not twentieth, century. The reasons for such title are explained in the 'Preface', which moreover contains remarks determining the book's character.

Chapter one, the 'Introduction', discusses the state of research and describes, in a manner interesting to historians, the art development process in the context of determinants and conditions of early Polish socio-political system, and referring to the still-relevant assumptions of Jacob Burckhardt, whereby history of art is approached as part of cultural history. The broad considerations on the definition of portrait, as an effigy of artistic value (p. 28), imply that the further argument will include not only representations considered by us to be portraits, in the colloquial meaning but also other such effigies or likenesses: from tombstone sculptures and medieval quasi-portraits through to tomb banners and coffin portraits.

Discussion of such representations is offered in chapter two – 'The Paths to the Modern Autonomous Portrait', containing descriptions of medieval representations of monarchs (Casimir III the Great, Ladislaus II Jagiełło), dignitaries – including founders and orants (the so-called Wiślica slab of orants), crypto-portraits, and sculpted or painted effigies of the deceased (tomb banners, epitaph portraits).

Chapter three – 'A Brief History of Portrait in Early Poland' – shows problems similar to these analysed above, mainly using the modern material. Considerations of the typology and stylistics of Old Polish portrait and its foreign (Central and East European) analogies are offered, along with analysis of Poland's two largest groups of portrait representations: stone tomb figures and painted portraits.

From a purely historical perspective, some arguments proposed by the author, or how they are expressed, seem disputable. For example, there is a short description (p. 159) of the portrait of King Stanislaus Augustus with an hourglass, painted by Marcello Bacciarelli in 1793. One might doubt whether the objects accompanying the monarch – the hourglass, a globe, and a crown – are merely Freemasonic symbols; their meaning is, apparently, broader: the globe stands for the world; the hourglass means time; the crown (lying derelict on the table) is the sovereign rule. The portrait shows a monarch who is tired of his life; aware of the rules governing the world of politics, the passing of time, and the lack of real instruments of power, he glances toward the sky in the hope that Providence would, someday, make it clearer above the Commonwealth once again.

In his discussion (p. 185) on the 'Sarmatian' portrait of Count Boris Sheremetev from 1686, showing the Russian diplomat and field marshal wearing a scale-armour and holding a baton and a curved sword, the author expresses his astonishment that Sheremetev, one of the closest associates of Tsar Peter I, who was a reformer and *zapadnik* (West-oriented man), did

not commission for a Western attire-style portrait. The date of the effigy explains the thing. Peter began his autonomous rule in 1689; he only took up a reform scheme, according to a primitively comprehended West European model, after he returned from his journey to the West in 1698. Polish cultural influence, so distinct under Feodor III, had continued in 1686. The Cossack elite is referred to (p. 186) as portrayed in their ‘national costumes’, which is anachronistic and thus misleading: after all, it is impossible to state what could have come across as a typical, let alone ‘national’, Ukrainian costume.

Given such extensive and detailed considerations, an expert might probably point to some unjustly neglected objects and call an analytic argument into question. I just would like to point out to the omission of two portraits, kept today in Kórnik, both of high interest to a historian focused on the eighteenth century: namely, two funny, ‘laid-back’ portrayals of Tsar Peter I and Ludwik Pociąg, Grand Hetman of Lithuania, respectively – both painted by Jan Kupecký of Vienna, and said to have been originally made for the Pociąg palace in Różanka. The tsar is shown down to his hips, wearing a lynx fur-lined coat on his naked body and a kalpak of the same sort. He holds a rifle and a red foulard under his right arm. The casual attire and pose, a rare example of representation of a monarch with no idealisation or attributes typical of official effigies, is reportedly owed to the circumstances: the portrait was made in 1711 (or 1712), during the tsar’s treatment in Karlsbad; Pociąg’s effigy was painted in parallel, in a similarly informal style, and was dedicated by Peter to Ludwik in commemoration of their common hunts and carousals. *Se non è vero, è ben trovato*.

Chapter four – ‘Portrait in the Society: Its Functions and Reception’ – is a study in the history of art and culture in one, discussing typical circumstances of making portraits and how they were exposed in public facilities or noble residences, as well as in private and partly-public (the latter emerging in the eighteenth century) portrait galleries – such as the royal portrait gallery arranged at the Warsaw Royal Castle on the order of King Stanislaus Augustus, or the magnate galleries owned by the Radziwiłł, Tyszkiewicz, or Jabłonowski families.

The chapter’s last sections analyse the art of portrait as a “mirror of collective and individual life”. The number of the preserved likenesses of noblemen and noblewomen, magnates (and Catholic clergymen) confirms the absolutely dominant role of the nobility’s culture in modern-age Poland-Lithuania. In this context, portraits of burghers (mainly from the Royal Prussia) appear as a very interesting phenomenon, along with the scarce portraits of peasants and Jews, possibly considered a sort of ‘genre painting’. The importance of these latter considerations to historians of culture is worth emphasising.

The large fifth, and last, chapter, entitled ‘The Realities Portrayed’, is a real treasure for historians specialising in diverse sub-disciplines of sciences auxiliary to history, as well as for those who would occasionally like to learn

who namely is shown in a given portrait: who was the figure portrayed, and what are the items of accompanying staffage meant to mean? The author instructively discusses not only the regalia, so frequent as they are in the portraits of major as well as minor rulers (to recall the amusing portrait of Hieronim Florian Radziwiłł, the forever-aspirer to any throne), but also the insignia and attributes of various authorities. We can find information on male attires, from the 'national' costume through to the diverse civilian uniforms (voivodship-related, 'friendly', official, courtly, etc.) that multiplied in the eighteenth century in Polish portraits of different sorts. Female garments, military attributes, signs and attributes of military, civilian, and clergy ranks, and order signs, are discussed as well. As for the latter, the most recent findings regarding the origins of the White Eagle Order are regrettably missing.¹

Jan K. Ostrowski's book triggers in the reader an association similar to that once aroused by the exhibition *The Self-Portrait of Polish People (Polaków portret własny)*, prepared by Marek Rostworowski in Cracow forty years ago (1979). It also makes one realise that albeit the Dutch genre painting of the 'Golden Age' is quantitatively far more extensive and richer in themes, the portrait painting in early Poland can also be the object of fruit-bearing and interesting studies for historians, art and culture researchers, including anthropologists, as a source for the study of the mores and morals, the material and spiritual culture, of the inhabitants of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth since the sixteenth century up to the nineteenth century.

While ending, it can be remarked that although the history of art has long ago ceased to be a 'science auxiliary to history', the study under review is evidence that effects of art historians' efforts still tend to be a valuable – and, at times, indeed irreplaceable – material in historical analysis. The work by Jan K. Ostrowski best illustrates this observation, and it should be hoped that its English version will soon be published, for foreign scholars to be able to make use of this rich and important material.

transl. *Tristan Korecki*

Wojciech Kriegseisen

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8748-4711>

¹ Cf. Jacek Burdowicz-Nowicki, 'Czy order Orła Białego ustanowiono dla rosyjskich generałów? O początkach odznaczenia 1698/1701–1705', *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, cxvii, 2 (2010), 5–20.

Volodymyr Sklokin, *Rosiis'ka imperiia i Slobids'ka Ukraina u druhii polovyni XVIII st.: prosvichenyi absoliutyzm, impers'ka intehratsiia, lokal'ne suspil'stvo*, Lviv, 2019, UCU Press, 286 pp., bibliog., index

It is difficult to overestimate the relevance of Slobozhanshchyna for the historical development of Ukraine as a whole. It has served as a hotbed of interest in Ukrainian-language folklore in the twilight of Enlightenment and at the dawn of Romanticism; a centre of historical research in the late nineteenth century; and a capital of the early Soviet Ukrainian culture and politics, to name but a few. The various fates of this region should also draw the attention of historians specialised in the age of Catherine the Great. Along with the Little Russian Hetmanate and Zaporozhzhia, Slobozhanshchyna was one of the three autonomous Ukrainian Cossack regions existing at the beginning of her reign, and the only one to have been established beyond the borders of the pre-Khmelnytskyi Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. More importantly, it was the first of the Empire's self-governing peripheral regions subjected to Catherine's zeal to bring light and order everywhere. As such, it should be an object of particular interest to anyone wishing to understand the workings of the Enlightenment state-building in Eastern Europe. Despite all this, Slobozhanshchyna in the late eighteenth century does not feature prominently in the historiography of Ukraine, nor the one devoted to the Russian Empire as a whole. Volodymyr Sklokin's monograph on the abolition of its autonomy is thus a very welcome and timely addition.

Sklokin is a reader of history at the Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv, but he comes from Kharkiv, the capital city of the very Slobozhanshchyna region itself, where he earned his PhD in 2010. He is a representative of a creative milieu of Kharkivian historians who focus on their city and region. The book here under review is based on Sklokin's dissertation dealing with the estate (*soslovie*) of military residents (*viis'kovi obyvateli*), into which Catherine's government transformed the bulk of Slobozhanshchyna's Cossacks.

In his book Sklokin describes and analyses the abolition of Slobozhanshchyna's administrative autonomy in the first years of Catherine's rule, followed by the prolonged transformation of the region's society. Unlike in the Little Russian Hetmanate, Slobozhanshchyna's autonomous authorities were not capped by the central authority of the hetman, with his court, chancery, and an uppermost echelon of Cossack officials. Instead, each of Slobozhanshchyna's regiments had its separate charter and functioned as a separate military-territorial unit subordinated to the Russian central government and administered by its own set of officials or elders (*starshyna*). This system had been established in the mid-seventeenth century by ethnically Ukrainian Cossacks migrating from the war-torn Hetmanate. Slobozhanshchyna's citizenry defined themselves in opposition to both the disenfranchised Muscovites and the licentious Little Russians. For many twentieth-century

historians (like Mykhailo Hrushevskyy), the Hetmanate was the paragon of early modern Ukrainian statehood, while Slobozhanshchyna, which lacked a central political authority, was only a bleak imitation. According to Sklokin however, Slobozhanshchyna's society was much closer to the egalitarian ideals of the seventeenth-century Cossack revolution than the Hetmanate, with its centralised structure dominated by the *starshyna* squirearchy.

More often than not, such stories about state-building and imperial integration are written from the vantage point of the central authorities, who are deemed to have introduced all the noteworthy ideas and then implemented them on the ground through their representatives. The traditional focus on great personages provides one explanation for this tendency, but more importantly, the extant archives tend to preserve documents written by the government officials themselves for their own purposes. Sklokin uses sources coming from the same stock, but he makes a consistent effort to recover the voices and fragments of the lived experiences of less prominent individuals, whom historical narratives usually gloss over. Combining several foci, he masterfully zooms in and out on different individual and collective agents: the imperial court, the Governing Senate, provincial governors, the region's elite, and even the rank-and-file Cossacks (although admittedly the latter to a much lesser extent).

In this way, Sklokin succeeds in painting a much more complicated picture, one in which regional, local, and individual factors prove key to understanding the process of the government-imposed integration of the Slobozhanshchyna and the dismantling of its early modern autonomy. This does not mean that the author neglects the more traditional part of the story and offers an exclusively grass-roots perspective. In fact, it can be argued that the single most important protagonist of his book is Catherine's trusted envoy, Evdokim Shcherbinin, an obedient and efficient executor of his monarch's will and by no means a figure of purely local significance.

Most of today's readers will probably find it difficult to sympathise with Shcherbinin, but Sklokin does his best to avoid vilifying him, which would have been all too easy. The author presents his protagonist as a complicated figure of the Enlightenment: an impulsive and seemingly corrupt cacique, but also a promoter of public education. More importantly, for Sklokin's purposes, Shcherbinin was a nodal figure in the complicated transactions that resulted in the transformation of Slobozhanshchyna. Receiving his orders from Saint Petersburg, he did his best to execute them faithfully. However, to achieve this, he had to extract information and muster support (or at least compliance) from the local actors. For this purpose, he had to balance incentives and threats with outright violence. Shcherbinin's success depended on his ability to navigate between the demands of his Empress and the sensitive sectors of Slobozhanshchyna's population.

Sklokin undermines the clear-cut border between state action and the local initiatives. This is not to say that he paints a blurry picture, in which the

great administrative and political transformation results from some ill-defined interplay between impersonal forces. He replaces the binary opposition of imperial government vs autonomist Cossack elites with a multidimensional narrative, in which there are more than two actors and they are not necessarily antagonistic all the time, but rather perform a dynamic capoeira-like spectacle. Clearly, it cannot be denied that Catherine had her reformist agenda and Slobozhanshchyna became its first testing ground, but a genuine local grievance presented by a wronged Cossack official served her as a pretext to intervene in the region. Later, her envoy Shcherbinin intimidated several prominent Cossack leaders with the help of evidence gathered from their local enemies and subordinates. In exchange for burying these sticky cases, he extracted formal excuses from these leaders, in which they blamed the antiquated autonomous institutions of the region for all the unpleasant misunderstandings. Thus, Shcherbinin succeeded in presenting the imperial government as the protector of the weak, the abolition of autonomy as being demanded by the local elite, and himself as a benevolent intercessor.

Shcherbinin's action was a masterful display of camouflaging the violent nature of Catherine's centralisation, but there is more to this story. The first striking feature is the pains taken by an absolutist government to secure at least a formal acceptance for its infringement of traditional rights and to position itself as the defender of the common people against an allegedly corrupt elite. One may ask why Catherine the Autocrat and Shcherbinin the Special Envoy needed this whole fuss? This is not explained by Sklokin, and although several educated guesses could be postulated, it is better to leave the answer to future researchers.

Secondly, the abolition of regimental autonomy was carried out by the imperial government based on a reform project submitted in 1760 by representatives of the region's elite, which Catherine trimmed according to her needs. Most importantly, the taxes imposed upon Slobozhanshchyna's population were higher than initially demanded, whereas vital administrative positions were given to nominees originating from non-Ukrainian provinces of the Empire. We should have no illusions about the nature of this operation: Catherine and Shcherbinin skilfully appropriated the proposal of the regional leaders and turned it against them. However, it illustrates again how carefully the government manoeuvred to present itself as acting in unison with the Cossack elders. It also shows that at least a significant part of the regional elite did agree that Slobozhanshchyna's constitution was outdated, and were able to formulate their own program of reform – one which was not completely outlandish nor disparate from the needs of a modern state. The regimental elders were not a bunch of incorrigibly backwards-looking provincials. Even though the abolition of autonomy was a brutal assault on their political freedom, its eventual outcome was, to a large extent, shaped by them. Perhaps the most outstanding achievement of Sklokin's book is

that he manages to balance his narrative in a way that allows him to avoid watering down the aggressive character of government's actions, but at the same time salvages the agency of local players.

Lastly, as Sklokin tells us, the government's reach was relatively shallow. In the beginning, the entire reform consisted in giving a few crucial jobs to trusted men (apparently Catherine already knew that 'cadres decide everything'), as well as changing the names of regional government bodies to make them sound more all-imperial.

Another major focus of Sklokin's book is on the transformation of Slobozhanshchyna's society engineered by the central government in the decades following the abolition of autonomy. The two main pillars of this operation were the imposition of a rigid system of estates (*sosloviia*) upon the region's inhabitants, and a gradual truncation of their traditional privileges, most notably their right to distil spirits tax-free and to own land individually. These issues may not seem particularly interesting to today's readers, but they were focal points of controversy among the population of Slobozhanshchyna in the late eighteenth century, as they determined the life opportunities of individuals of all ranks and, as a consequence, their identities. Sklokin emphasises that people in the late eighteenth century did not, by any means, follow what we might expect from today's point of view. For example, when it suited their economic needs, Slobozhanshchyna's *viis'kovi obyvateli* could actually prefer the Muscovite-style collective ownership of land over individual holding. In turn, to the members of the regimental elite, the Russian imperial bureaucracy offered attractive careers, although this did not mean that they would all become enchanted by this.

In the context of the ongoing Russo-Ukrainian war, many early modern historians are tempted to advertise their research as topical by claiming they can provide clear-cut explanations of the present situation. Fortunately, Sklokin avoids reproducing a teleological vision of the past in which the Catherinian Empire is the direct progenitor of today's Russian nationalism, whereas the early modern Ukrainian Cossack autonomies together form a cocoon concealing the modern Ukrainian nationality. Only in the last chapter, which fits awkwardly within the rest of the book, does he indulge in fitting the past realities into the Procrustean bed of anachronistic national categorisations by attempting to outline a Ukrainian Enlightenment. The author of this review is left with an impression that it would have been more justifiable and fruitful to stick to the identifications from the period and describe two interconnected, but independent, Enlightenments: Slobozhanshchyna's and the Hetmanate's. Even though it is hard to understand why Sklokin chose to close his book with this chapter, it nevertheless contains much food for thought.

The book explores fundamental transformations in the understudied first half of the Koselleckian *Sattelzeit* in a region that has proved crucial for the Ukrainian political and intellectual life in the nineteenth, twentieth, and

twenty-first centuries. It also contributes to the scholarship on Catherine's regularisation and unification of the Russian Empire. The focus in this field has usually been either on the Muscovite core territories or on areas whose *Landespatriotismus* could be easily claimed by the later nation-builders, such as the Hetmanate or Livonia. Topics which do not easily fit within the necessities of nationalised history writing – like the abolition of regional privileges in Slobozhanshchyna and the Smolensk region – have been neglected, even though they are key elements of the same historiographical puzzle: after all, Slobozhanshchyna served Catherine as a first testing ground for many of her ideas.

Sklokin positions his findings within the current of new imperial history, championed by the milieu of the *Ab Imperio* quarterly. Slobozhanshchyna's subjugation by Catherine's officials, however, does not seem to reflect anything specifically 'imperial'. In fact, for each use of the words 'empire' and 'imperial' we could substitute 'state', and it would not change the sense of Sklokin's argument. According to Jane Burbank and Fred Cooper, empires are characterised by 'politics of difference', as they govern different peoples and territories in different ways. In the case of this region, Catherine did not wish to govern by cultivating differences, but to obliterate them (whether she succeeded or not is another matter, but most unitary states do not manage to unify their territories and populations fully). Sklokin's story seems to be a good example of how an early modern composite monarchy tried to reconstruct itself as a centralised bureaucratic state, not unlike the one we know from Tocqueville's *The Old Regime and the Revolution*. The word 'empire' has become a fashionable label in East European history, but its widespread application seems to have exhausted its explanatory value, as nowadays everything in our field can be characterised as 'imperial', 'colonial', or 'postcolonial'. Perhaps it is time to dust off the old and outwardly lacklustre concept of state-building. Volodymyr Sklokin has written an important book on this phenomenon, and it is no mean feat.

proofreading James Hartzell

Tomasz Hen-Konarski

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8062-9156>

Jan Jakub Surman, *Universities in Imperial Austria, 1848–1918. A Social History of a Multilingual Space*, West Lafayette, IN, 2019, Purdue University Press, 458 pp., indexes, ill., tables; series: Central European Studies

It might not seem very elegant to start a review with a mention of a book not identical with the one under review. As a good excuse for this impertinence, let me note that as regards the study by Jan J. Surman, it would mean a compliment. Perhaps recently the most resounding voice in the never-ending

discussion on the character and reasons behind the collapse of the Habsburg empire was the one of Pieter M. Judson, author of *The Habsburg Empire: A New History* (2016). One of the emphases of this study is the long-lasting influence of Austria-Hungary in the culture, including political culture, of the succession countries. Judson takes away from them the odium of self-culpability for the collapse, pointing instead to the success story of the liberal empire and (paradoxically) its ability to survive. Surman's book, which shortly followed Judson's, is basically an earlier one as it is based on a PhD thesis submitted at the Vienna University in 2012. The reader interested in the interpretation proposed by Judson will find in it a reliably studied tread of the same history, showing the functionality and vitality of the Austro-Hungarian scholarship, in its entirety, also after the confirmed death of the monarchy. In a broader perspective, it is a serious vote for a creative and flexible attitude toward reforming the education system. Based on the universities, learned societies and the Austro-Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Surman demonstrates that the real internationalisation of science should be based neither on a centralisation nor a linguistic standardisation of scientific output. On the contrary: the Habsburg science and tertiary education systems indicate that the principle of subsidiarity and linguistic diversity prove themselves as catalysts of humanistic creative work.

Surman's book is composed of a foreword, seven chronological/thematic chapters, a conclusion and two annexes (the first specifying the 'Disciplines of Habilitation at Austrian Universities', the second being a list of links to the Databases of Scholars at Cisleithanian Universities). The primary sources include documents and correspondence in the multiple languages used in the Habsburg Monarchy. The author's exquisite linguistic meticulousness and care for documentary precision deserve special mention in this context. Errors, if any, happen only incidentally, resulting from misunderstandings rather than ignorance (one of the very few examples being 'eastern borderlands', instead of 'western borderlands', of the Ukrainian lands referred to on p. 262).

The narrative begins in the late eighteenth century; chapter one leads us through the prehistory of the Austrian system up to the Spring of the Nations. The central character in chapter two is Leopold (Leo), Graf von Thun und Hohenstein, Minister of Public Instruction and Religions. The system he created, identified at times with a reaction policy due to the official pressure to use the German language, actually laid the foundations for the development of national academic organisations and reinforced the strong position of philosophical faculties at the universities. It was these faculties that the monarchy's national sub-systems of science and education would develop within, in multiple languages. Chapter three describes the impact of the general political liberalisation on the universities. Increased autonomy of the universities and colleges went hand in hand with the change in the language of instruction – to the benefit of the one dominant in a given

province, and with the emergence of typical paths of promotion and an informal hierarchy of the Habsburg tertiary schools. These processes are illustrated with examples from Austrian lands, Bohemia, and Galicia, collected in the two subsequent chapters. Surman analyses the structure of the research and teaching staff, whose core members were (unchangeably) the *Privatdozents*, working for free. Represented numerous at the best universities, they contributed to the cultural development of some cities, owing to their extramural activities. In provincial centres, the staffing pyramid was reversed, the professors outnumbering the private docents. Moving house in search of work was an important aspect of careers of numerous scholars; Vienna, in particular – the largest cluster of the young personnel – exported its young scholars to provincial universities.

With the introduction of Polish and Czech as the languages of instruction at the universities – a process that was completed in the 1880s – and once the University of Prague was split into two institutions: Czech and German, certain dualities became visible in the Habsburg science. They were initially not grave enough to threaten the science's unity or inhibit its intellectual or organisational development. The more rigid the requirement of having a command of a language other than German became, the weaker the flow of academic staff between Vienna and non-German provincial universities. As Surman demonstrates, these developments did not doom Cracow or Lwów/Lemberg, or the Czech university in Prague, to isolation or degeneration: in each of these cases, the rule of mobility, though in a different way, was maintained. The inflow of scholars and students from other parts of Polish territory (subjects of other monarchs) supplied Polish-speaking universities. Intensive collaboration with polytechnic schools and quite an extensive programme of foreign practices, of which Czech scholars took advantage, was supportive to the university in Prague. Prevented imports of young scholars from Vienna did not mean getting closed to external impulses.

Chapter six points to the reverse side of this optimistic story of dynamic development of the universities and, thanks to their 'nationalisation', of the cultures of the monarchy's peoples as well. Anti-Semitism grew stronger at the end of the nineteenth century, and the promotion paths for private docents of Jewish descent were thus blocked. While in the middle of the century baptism was sufficient for one's career, a few dozen years later, the change of religion lost this power, dooming the scholars of Jewish origin to marginalisation.

The last, and very short, chapter deals with the First World War period and the elements of continuation and expansion of the Habsburg know-how in the succession countries. Staff members of former Austro-Hungarian universities joined new universities, contributing their customs and habits based on their socialisation before 1914. Admission of women to universities appeared, in a shorter perspective, salutary for their material existence and,

in the longer run (beyond the period covered by the book in question), for the scientific development. The role of Vienna as a centre attracting the scholars who were rejected by the increasingly nationalistic universities of East Central Europe was taken over in the two interwar decades by Prague. The Habsburg type of university did not perish with the monarchy: on the contrary, it expanded beyond its former limits; only the Second World War marked a fundamental caesura for it.

The history described in Surman's book can be read as an anthem in praise of Hašekian moderate progress, within the bounds of the law, in the field of higher education. The structures were getting formed at a slow pace, and it was done basically through limited renovations or annexes attached to the existing edifice, rather than by way of a revolutionary redevelopment. Minister Thun-Hohenstein did seek to strengthen Catholicism and reinforce the monarchy's coherence, but the processes he initiated – the solidification of the philosophical faculties, in the first place – contributed to the nationalisation of the universities, which was initiated in the 1860s and completed by the century's end. This nationalisation did not prove destructive for the 'affected' schools at all. Care for maintenance of multilingual character of scholarship and international contacts became a standard among those who spoke and acted in favour of the nationalisation. In spite of their diversity – or, perhaps, thanks to its gradating influence – the scientific institutions of Austria-Hungary formed a cohesive system whose peripheries, as the author demonstrates, were an active contributor rather than merely a recipient of the impulses generated by Vienna. As it became apparent after 1918, the system kept its expansive and reproductive potential even after the monarchy collapsed.

It is precisely the system's cohesiveness – *e pluribus unum*, as the adage has it – which in itself is an example of a transfer through the ages and through the ocean, that is the major element of the interpretation offered by the author:

In contrast with the historiography that has come out of central European scholarship, this work suggests a large number of entanglements that I see as characteristic of the Habsburg Empire: a linguistically divided but still culturally entangled scientific space. Historians in the twentieth century have largely disregarded the productive edge of this multicultural state, the Habsburg Empire, looking at it with a national framework in mind. But during the empire's existence, monoculturalism and trends toward intellectual seclusion were often outweighed by developments and changes favouring interdependence (p. 279).

The history of the scholarship institutions is but one of the layers of this story, in fact. The other one is individual and group career paths of the scholars and researchers. This exquisitely documented book will tell us how much the scholars earned, what conditions of work they were offered, and how they dealt (successfully or not) with the challenges stemming from the

evolution of the universities. Also, what tricks they resorted to if they were willing to extort a rise of their wages (this being one more good reason to read this book). This history, and story, is not one without shadows, though. One may view it, however, crooked this view would be, as a catalogue of the excluded and the removed, those spitted out by the system. Mobility coerced by the Austrian system blocked the career paths of those scholars who, for a variety of reasons, were incapable of following it, or not ready to follow it. Such persons usually formed the group of *Privatdozents*, with the main fields of their activities situated outside the university. More importantly, taking into account the transition after the year 1918, Habsburg universities prevented women from enrolling in their courses. The first habilitation of a female scholar took place only in 1905. The nationalisation of the universities meant doing away with those of the staff who had insufficient command of the new language of instruction. In Hungary (that is, basically beyond the scope of the author's interest), the cleansing was unparalleled in reach, but long-standing university scholars had to leave their workplaces also in Cracow, Lwów, and Prague, too. With the progress of the nationalisation, access to careers was becoming increasingly difficult for Jews as well as Ukrainians. The latter unsuccessfully fought for a university of their own; the enormous hopes they attached to this postulate can be treated as an indicator of the importance of universities in the life of the Habsburg monarchy's nations. Lastly, the Austrian universities were a field of outlook battles in which the Catholic Church was involved.

One more aspect of the book that I should like to point to is the lesson given by the history of the Austrian universities to the present-day reformers of higher education systems. Putting it short, the lesson says that no shortcut can guarantee success in science, education, or scholarship in general. The monarchy's universities chose (or, just followed) a longer, meandering way between the idea of tertiary schools as factories producing German-speaking clerks and officials, the project of the one-and-only German-speaking academic community, and segmentation along the lines of national divisions. None of these radical options was fulfilled; instead, the system preserved the valuable elements of each. The universities maintained their association with the state, providing it with human resources of expertise. High internationalisation of scholars, who published, as a rule, in their native languages and in German, plus – quite often – in some of the other languages of academic exchange, remained valid. This is, at least partly, why historians researching into ethnic issues of the Habsburg monarchy have at their disposal sources produced by nationalists of all the nations in the country's common language (authors such as Henryk Wereszycki or Józef Chlebowczyk have proved their ability to use this opportunity). Instead of being at odds with the idea to turn the universities into national institutions, the internationalisation became their element of importance – so much that it survived the 1918 upheaval. Similarly

to the Austrian university model, it was quite an achievement of moderate progress (within the limits of the law, of course).

transl. *Tristan Korecki*

Maciej Górny

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8594-1365>

Jan Arendt (ed.), *Science and Empire in Eastern Europe: Imperial Russia and the Habsburg Monarchy in the 19th Century*, Göttingen, 2020, Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 334 pp., index of persons; series: Bad Wiesseer Tagungen des Collegium Carolinum, 38

With a long tradition behind them, the annual conferences of the Collegium Carolinum, the Munich-based research institution specialising in the history of Bohemian lands, have earned merited renown. These events long ago crossed the originally set territorial framework, extending to the entire East Central Europe in respect of issues that historians are currently passionate about. The subjects addressed in the previous years included environmental history, history of urban areas, history of historiography, or gender history. The most recent conference volume brings a new episode in the story on East Central European land empires in the age of imperialism, seen through the prism of the history of science.

The topic of imperialism primarily brings to mind the colonial expansion perpetrated by entrepreneurs, the state, and science (in the service of the state). The authors of the book under review address the last two issues, focusing for the most part on reciprocal penetration, cooperation and conflicts between the authorities and scientists or scholars. While the topic is not a new one ('scientific conquest' of the Orient was the issue that gave rise to postcolonial studies), it has been relatively rarely taken up in reference to the eastern part of Europe.

The answer to such questions cannot be unambiguous – the sufficient reason being its distribution across several thematically disparate chapters. The topics addressed in the book are quite diverse; the content is structured into as many as seven parts, each containing one to three articles. Part one, dealing with scientific associations and academies of sciences, includes two articles. Using the example of the endeavours to establish an Academy of Sciences in Prague, Martin Franc demonstrates how complicated and politicised an affair the project was – apparently, a purely scientific one. Disputes evolved not only around the language to be binding for the Academy (Czech, German, or both – for a bilingual institution?) but also its ideological profile (more or less conservative?) and the question whether such institution's role should only be to deepen the knowledge or also (if not primarily) to popularise it. The Czech Academy of Sciences and Arts (ČAVU) owed its final shape not so

much to the visions of scholars or political pressure as to the requirements of the private sponsor who accepted to fund the venture. In the subsequent article, Maciej Janowski describes the network of scientific associations in the lands of former Poland-Lithuania (then under partitions) and adds one more piece to the jigsaw – namely, the social role of the intelligentsia, the group that was capable of forming structures regardless of the state's activities.

The section on universities opens with an article by Jan Surman, interestingly following up the arguments proposed in his recent book (reviewed in the present volume of *APH*).¹ Surman analyses doublespeak on the Austrian tertiary education system from the 1840s: the opinion of Ludwik Tęgoborski, a Polish-born Russian official, and William Robert Willis Wilde, a physician (and father of Oscar, which is an irrelevant fact). With all the differences between the two perspectives, Tęgoborski's being the more conservative one, their mutually supportive criticism of the backwardness of Austrian universities was accompanied with respect for some aspects of the Habsburg educational system (for instance, the polytechnic education) and for the enlightened pursuit for equality of educational opportunities. Despite the liberal criticism which in the Spring of Nations time ruthlessly hammered the Austrian higher schools, the universities performed fairly well in the early 1840s.

Another text in this part of the book is an attempt at the quantitative evaluation of the degree of Austro-Hungarian universities' involvement in the making of an 'imperial knowledge'. Mark Hengerer and Sabrina Rospert propose their evaluation based on the titles of classes offered at the universities between the second half of the 1860s and the beginning of the twentieth century. The conclusion they have drawn is that roughly a fourth or fifth of the classes offered in Vienna and Budapest could be termed 'imperial'; the proportion remained fairly stable. The real value of these findings should be verified based, primarily, on the overly formal criteria applied by the authors. Since the term 'empire' they refer both to the Habsburg monarchy and the Roman Empire, the actual degree of the universities' involvement in propagation of knowledge on Austro-Hungary and the idea of unity of the dualistic monarchy cannot be estimated based on their calculations. Incidentally, the authors admit that most such classes were held at the faculties of law (where probably a considerable part of them was in the form of tutorials and lectures on the Roman law) or philosophy (extending to all the fields of humanities, philosophy and ancient history included). To make this analysis more useful, a more precise distinction among the classes' topics (apart from the appearance of indicative keywords) or, more preferably, a comparison of the collected data against the curriculum of some tertiary school outside the Habsburg monarchy should have been proposed. In the latter case, it might have occurred that,

¹ Jan Jakub Surman, *Universities in Imperial Austria, 1848–1918. A Social History of a Multilingual Space* (West Lafayette, 2019).

for instance, the University of Iași offered its students a high percentage of 'imperial' classes compared to the Universities of Vienna and Budapest, though it was by no means an imperial school.

The section on universities concludes with a very interesting article by Andrej Andreev, describing three generations of superintendents at the Russian universities in the former half of the nineteenth century. Contrary to the conception well-established in historiography, Andreev maintains that superintendents did not act as political supervisors but rather agents streamlining the university's contacts with the state authorities. What is more, equipped with broad competencies and, at least in their first generation, more liberal than the university authorities, the superintendents knew how to really support the professors in their endeavours to stay independent. Rather astonishingly, this quite interesting text completely omits the important event of the closing down of the Empire's leading University of Vilna, as a repressive measure following the Polish November Insurrection of 1830–1. The question of how this fact impacted the tsarist policy towards the other universities is pretty essential, particularly if we bear in mind that a large group of Vilna's former professorial staff was taken over by the University of Kiev, which is otherwise Andreev's object of interest.

The next two articles describe the careers of scholars (including amateur scientists) who were led along the path of service to the Empire to the country's far ends. Daniel Baric follows the career of Carl Partsch, archaeologist and, at the time, the leading specialist in the Roman past of Bosnia. A subtle analysis of his publications and public statements shows how, with the years spent in Sarajevo, Partsch was turning into a Habsburgian Bosnian, a patriot of his new small home country, determined to restore its past splendour, now under the aegis of the Emperor of Austria. A different career model is recounted by Matthias Goldbeck, whose article deals with Nikolai Fedorovič Petrovskii, Russian Empire's Consul to Turkestan. Basing mainly on Petrovskii's correspondence, the author follows his career as an official along with his endeavours in the field of archaeology and numismatics. The Consul himself dreamed of top positions with the Russian administration, while his activities as a scientist eventually earned him a name.

Part four offers two articles describing the history of Oriental studies as a scientific discipline in Austro-Hungary and Russia. Both texts – by Johannes Feichtinger and Arpine Maniero, respectively – primarily have an enormous informative value. Since its modern origins, up to the twentieth-century interwar period, the history of Oriental studies provide, as Feichtinger remarks, a much richer and complicated material than the vision outlined in the fundamental book by Edward Said. In the Russian case, Maniero points to a synergy between the imperial strife for a scientific conquest of the Orient, on the one hand, and the emancipative strivings of the local peoples, on the other. The expertly specialised Russian universities were of use to both parties.

The following part takes up the subject-matter addressed by Maniero. The leading issue in its three articles, inspired by the new imperial history, is the competition of imperial and national structures, including mutual, in the geographical context. Borbála Zsuzsanna Török analyses the quite tense mutual relation of three versions of regional history (*Landeskunde*) in Transylvania before and after the conclusion of the Austro-Hungarian Compromise. The scientific societies of Transylvanian Saxons, Hungarians and Romanians oscillated in their operations between a-national regionalism and nationalism. Since there were three contestants for the challenge, there were opportunities to swap alliances or remain uninvolved and comment on the ethnic conflict in an allegedly unbiased manner. Such was the position that, at the end of the period analysed by Török, the Saxon regional scholars assumed, who reported on the intensifying dispute between their Hungarian and Romanian colleagues, debating on the historical primacy in the province. The second article in this section, penned by Peter Haslinger, demonstrates, based on a rich material, how much in common the origins of geopolitical thinking in the Habsburg monarchy had with the interwar politicised geography of its succession countries, Poland and Hungary in the first place. A 'geographical determinism' shared by an entire cohort of scholars active before and after 1918 led them toward multiplying imperial patterns. In the third, and last, article on geographical aspects, Guido Hausmann proposes a corresponding argument about tsarist Russia and the Soviet Union. In the latter case, it was only the Stalinisation in the late 1920s and early 1930s that came as a personal and methodological breakthrough, with far-reaching and fatal consequences.

The next, sixth, part of the book only contains one article (which is somewhat astonishing). Volker Zimmermann proposes a comparison between the Russian, German and Austro-Hungarian criminal anthropologies. The discipline, associated with the name of Cesare Lombroso, had in reality much more serious coryphées who approached the Italian scholar's deterministic theories with reservation. In any case, none of the East Central European land empires was free of attempts to prove that certain ethnic groups, which generally lived on the country's geographical or social margin, manifested a predilection for a specified type of crime. Zimmermann perceives this mechanism as a typical manifestation of colonialism; while this statement is basically acceptable, specific gaps in his argumentation are noticeable. First, limiting himself to analysing publications authored by criminologists belonging to the 'ruling nations', the author denies the vote to members of some of those stigmatised ethnic groups. Taking their opinions or statements into consideration might have enriched the rather one-dimensional picture he outlines. Second, the author neglects the role of psychiatry in criminologist theory and practice, which increased in the early twentieth century mainly in Austria (but not in Bohemia), thus becoming competitive

against theories based on ethnic statistics. Freudians looked for the premises behind degeneration elsewhere.

The last in the volume is a set of three articles dealing with aspects of natural sciences. Marianne Klemun compares Austrian geological and botanical societies. The former, k.k. Geologische Reichsanstalt, was a state-owned institution, while the latter – k.k. Zoologisch-botanische Gesellschaft – was a non-governmental institution; hence, they differed in the way they functioned. Whereas the geological society pursued research consistently kept within the real and symbolic frontiers of the Empire, the botanists habitually departed from this standard, in favour of regional approaches or references to national territories. The subsequent two texts, respectively by Jan Arend and David Moon, dealing with the influence of Russian soil science on scholars outside Russia, seem extremely interesting. Arend identifies a specific channel through which knowledge was transferred between Russia and Germany; soon, during the Second World War, the knowledge borrowed in this way contributed to economic exploitation of the territories occupied by the Third Reich. Agronomy played an enormous, though long-underestimated, role in the ideology of Nazism² – and, in this specific case, also in the attempt at practical implementation of Adolf Hitler's new imperial project. Moon complements this picture by indicating that the innovativeness of Russian pedology attracted the attention not only of Germans but also of Americans who endeavoured to adapt the soil classification methods elaborated in Russia to their own needs.

There is more that divides than unites the studies collected in the volume, at first glance. The chronology (the 'nineteenth century' appearing in the title) is treated quite flexibly by the authors; in terms of territory, excursions outside Russia or Austro-Hungary are undertaken in some of the texts. The dispersion of scientific disciplines and organisational issues related to science is also considerable. The editor's arrangement of the material into seven parts does not remove the impression of thematic fragmentation, as it appears incoherent. Some of these sections relate to structures (scientific associations, academies, universities), others to biographies of scientists or scholars, others still, to disciplines. To give an example, Török's study on the Transylvanian *Landeskunde* might equally well have been included in the section on scientific structures rather than geography. A division according to a different set of criteria – like, for instance, the dynamism of the processes analysed in the articles (colonial expansion, the competition of local factors, the transition from the imperial into a post-imperial order) – would have been more reasonable, perhaps.

Despite these reservations, the study in question by no means appears a chaotic set of incongruent stories. Conversely, it is considerable merit

² See Isabel Heinemann, *Rasse, Siedlung, deutsches Blut: Das Rasse- und Siedlungshauptamt der SS und die Rassenpolitische Neuordnung Europas* (Göttingen, 2003), 49–120.

of most of the co-authors that, having embarked on so diverse issues and problems, they consistently stick to the central subject-matter, defined as science encountering the authority with imperial aspirations. What are the conclusions that can be drawn based on the entire book? Jan Arend identifies one of them in the introductory section:

Perhaps one of the most important conclusions of this volume is that seafaring and land-based empires were not dissimilar in terms of the relationships between science and empire observable within them. This applies to the fundamental, imperialism-constituting role of science as well as to the mutual functional entanglement. In this sense, the European continental empires were no less “modern” than their sea-going and colonial counterparts (p. 21).

If, despite all the similarities between imperial structures, the results and circumstances of colonial expansion in East Central Europe have proved different from those in Africa or Asia, the reasons behind this state of affairs ought to be sought on the part of the colonised, rather than the colonisers. The studies included in the book under review portray diverse forms of subjectivity, or empowerment, which restricted the potential of state power. Not only the imperial centre was capable of making use of the language of science and built modern organisational structures; other actors also successfully used the same instruments. While this fact does not make the use of postcolonial theory tools easier, it does make the history of our part of the world more interesting.

transl. *Tristan Korecki*

Maciej Górný

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8594-1365>

Heidi Hein-Kircher, *Lemberg's 'polnischen Charakter' sichern. Kommunalpolitik in einer multiethnischen Stadt der Habsburgermonarchie zwischen 1861/62 und 1914*, Stuttgart, 2020, Franz Steiner Verlag, 404 pp., 27 ill., 10 tables; series: Beiträge zur Stadtgeschichte und Urbanisierungsforschung, 21

The book by Heidi Hein-Kircher, a researcher at the Herder Institute for Historical Research on East Central Europe in Marburg – deals with the city of Lwów/Lviv/Lemberg in Austrian Galicia during the autonomous period. The author has worked on the history of the city for several years, and this is hardly her first publication on the topic. Indeed, this city, one of the most modern urban centres at the Eastern periphery of the Habsburg Dual Monarchy, has been the object of special attention of scholars for at least the last two decades. Studies and accounts on this ethnically mostly Polish city (till 1945),

were already advanced in the interwar period. However, the aftermath of the Second World War and the change of state affiliation (from Poland to Soviet Ukraine) led to an informal ban on its research, making studies on it behind the Iron Curtain very limited for more than 40 years. In one of the more recent comprehensive books on the topic, *Habsburg Lemberg* (2009), Markian Prokopovych tried to capture the entirety of the political and spatial events in Lemberg (he chose to use this official name of the city, as did the author of the reviewed book, hence I will also stick to it in this review), arguing that the nationalising policy of the city councillors and presidents failed to transform Lemberg and that it remained a truly 'imperial' city, one of many in the Habsburg realm. Heidi Hein-Kircher's book examines the communal policy, as well as the municipal discourse, practices, and visions, and argues that everything which the council undertook was indeed nationalising and that it succeeded in changing the city. Both points of view entail some exaggerations, but Hein-Kircher's book succeeds in providing sufficient source material and a sound methodology to prove her thesis. One may wonder how spatial development and the building of infrastructure can be seen as nationalising? It is possible if we look not so much at the physical works undertaken, but at the discourse surrounding them. Indeed, the whole book is about the urban discourses present in the sources produced by the urban hosts (as broadly conceived): city councillors, members of the magistrate, and all the professionals employed by the city. Although the author writes about the 'best practices' approach to urban policy, meaning the practice of choosing the best solutions worked out abroad which could be applied to local problems, i.e. the advantage of undertaking modernisation late and about the raising of funds earmarked for urban investments (which is instructive), the book is not so much about what exactly happened in the city and how, but rather about how it was described, advertised and explained in the written sources. What is more, the author states that it was wholly normal that an 'emerging city' (a term coined by the author and Eszter Gantner to describe multi-ethnic urban centres in Central and Central-Eastern Europe) was at the same time modernising and nationalising. I am not sure if these two always went hand-in-hand in the region and period in question, and the author does not explain it sufficiently either, but the fact is that modernising activities and successes in this field, as described in the municipal publications, were used to serve as a legitimisation discourse for the Polish nationalising politics in Lemberg.

The book not only offers a national(istic) interpretative key, which definitively would have been too little but also offers a fresh new one – that of the *securitisation*. One of the primary presumptions of the author is that the city council's debates and the whole local political discourse were permeated by the categories of fear and threat, often presented in a dramatic manner, and by the perceived need to defend against everything which was not Polish in

its character (p. 15); which in practice meant anything Ukrainian or Jewish in character, and which referred to the two other main ethnic groups in Lemberg (it should be noted here that up to almost the last pages the author uses the term 'Ruthenian' instead of Ukrainian or Ruthenian/Ukrainian). Other vital processes analysed here involved the simultaneous modernisation of infrastructure and urban beautification along with the 'nationalisation' of the city, starting already from the 1860s, the time of civic enfranchisement in the Habsburg Monarchy. Instead of answering the question of the relationship between these processes, the author chooses to address the issue of securing the national character of the city and places her analyses in the context of a less – in my view – visible strand in urban studies, namely the securitisation studies. According to the author's hypothesis, the urban development of multi-ethnic towns and cities was unthinkable without the securitising discourses of nationalisation (*versicherheitlichende Nationalisierungsdiskurse*) (p. 18). This trend, which in effect tended to galvanise national feuds in the city, was connected with the rising national ambitions of the Poles and their mental map of the city, which stylised Lemberg as a non-formal (ersatz-) capital of a non-existent Polish state. The author draws on the concept of securitisation discourses conceived of as, like many other phenomena, a social construct in the writings of, among others, Eckart Conze, which she connects to the scholarship of Pieter Judson on the Habsburg Monarchy. In this vein, social security is seen as a crucial tool for the proponents of political nationalism in the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries. The other important key is the understanding of the policy as a cultural practice, which frees the researcher from the duty to extensively present the political parties which competed for power and their programs and electoral strategies (with which the readers – to be frank – may be already a bit fed-up).

After the introductory notes, chapter two deals with the transformation of the legal standing of the city council in Lemberg, depicting the situation of the city briefly from the Middle Ages through to the political struggles of the nineteenth century. This chapter explains how the reforms of the 1860s affected the statutes of larger towns and cities in the Austrian part of the Dual Monarchy (since 1867). At the same time, reserving some crucial functions for itself (like, e.g., police control over public order), the state ceded a broad autonomy to city councils, which led to the councils playing an important, even if local, political role. This introduction sets the stage for an examination of the modernising, nationalising and, in effect, Polonising policy of the Lemberg council.

Chapter three describes the communal autonomy as it functioned in practice. The theatrical metaphor of a stage and actors finds its continuation here, as the political scene is called an 'arena' (*Arena*), which is subject to appropriating and securing. Readers learn about the discussions concerning the city statute, where the discourse of threat and securitisation comes to

the foreground, i.e. the threat of losing control over the city by the Polish politicians and of the possible influence of the state and other ethnic groups in Lemberg. The debates involved, among others, more abstract issues, like that of the Jewish loyalty (towards the state or the Poles?), as well as minor, although not insignificant, problems regarding the municipal possessions, which the councillors deemed to belong exclusively to the Christians. These struggles were crucial for establishing a political stage wherein the Poles could dominate. Next, we have a depiction of the practices of ‘stabilising the stage’ (the verb stemming from the scholarship on the discourse) during the fierce Polish-Ruthenian/Ukrainian debates over the official language(s) of the council. Such a ‘stabilised’ stage was then subject – according to the author – to protection, including in the way the municipal elections were tinkered with (for example in the details of the election rules). Such practices, as the author underlines, have not been taken into account in the Polish scholarship on the era (p. 124), though it must be said that the general tendency to exclude non-Polish voters is indeed not unknown. As a consequence, candidates running in the elections tended to be less Ruthenian/Ukrainian and more partisan, as the end of the nineteenth century saw the rise of modern political parties, and of their presence at the local level as well. For the author, it is not the skulduggeries that are the centre of attention, but the crystallising points of the securitising discourse, and it is the democratising reform of 1906 and the threat of new Ruthenian/Ukrainian and Jewish voters, as perceived by the urban elite, which are the focus of particular interest.

Chapter four highlights the process of bringing about the physical shape of the city of Lemberg, i.e. its spatial and infrastructural development. The councillors termed the plan to modernise the city as ‘beautiful Lemberg’, which is in line with the general trend in urban planning.¹ This term also meant the physical and mental health of the inhabitants, i.e. public hygiene, which won the upper hand from the mid-century. This chapter deals with a great many issues, from the general regulatory plan (which failed to be decreed), the location of new important centre-creating edifices like the theatre and the railway station, along with the infrastructure, which also included the covering-up of the river in the central part of the city. The author presents the ongoing debates, explaining mainly the stances held by the Polish councillors, but also additionally, even if a bit too rarely, gives voice to the non-Polish actors. Their point of view was only partially expressed at the council and instead more often in the press, which explains the author’s emphasis on the former, as she chose to examine mainly the municipal sources. The main argument involves the nationalising aspects of the modernisation,

¹ Compare e.g. Pressburg/Pozsony/Bratislava in the same period: Eleonóra Babejová, *Fin-de-Siècle Pressburg. Conflict & Cultural Coexistence in Bratislava 1867–1914* (New York, 2003), 75–7.

i.e. the Polonisation of the urban development in the form of, e.g., hiring Polish companies and engineers to carry out the urban works (pp. 187–8), or the anti-Semitic arguments used in the discourse about urban spatial development and about the means of counteracting the cholera outbreaks (p. 195), which, to be sure, were hardly specific for Lemberg. Finally, the author brilliantly shows how the discussions about the provision of food in the city and its prices were permeated by the securitisation discourse and calculated fear-mongering, and how this led to further nationalisation of the communal politics (p. 213).

Chapter five examines the educational and cultural policy of the city council. This topic is highly idiosyncratic of the Habsburg Monarchy and the rise of national ideals within this state and was (or still is) one of the key points in the historiography on the topic, e.g. in the writings of Jeremy King or Pieter Judson. The political shape of Austria-Hungary and its whole identity were negotiated and created around issues such as, among others, school languages and the installation of new school buildings in mixed-language regions in the context of the enfranchisement of the 'peoples' in the monarchy (1867).

The provision of new schools is analysed, with the school buildings forming part of the widely-advertised 'new public space' of the modern Polish Lemberg (p. 224), along with the data showing that the educational needs were still far from being met in 1914. The author argues that it was the municipal institutions (i.e. the council) which opposed the building of new Ruthenian/Ukrainian-language schools in the districts with higher shares of this ethnicity, often in opposition to the regional institutions like the Land School Council. The primary purpose of the municipal policy towards the Ruthenian/Ukrainian, as well as the religious Jewish or Protestant schools, was to secure schools as places of assimilation and ensure the spread of the Polish language. Also, the role of the university as a 'sanctuary of the Polish ambitions' is mentioned, albeit briefly because the issue is well described in the literature. The last part of the chapter is devoted to the development of cultural institutions in Lemberg, most notably the municipal theatre. Such institutions, though often and rightly declared to be private undertakings, belonged to the realm of a broader urban community and were meant to be part of the nationalising force (e.g. the promotion of the Polish high culture, which sometimes openly stood in opposition to the need to reach truly mass audiences, who did not want to be nationally 'educated' in theatres). The chapter ends with a depiction of the planned Municipal Art Gallery (displaying not art in general but Polish art as the 'arsenal of the Polish culture') and the Municipal Museum (presenting in fact not the city's history, but the Polish history of the city).

Chapter six refers to the broader cultural issues, commemorations, and history-writing, which helped to place Lemberg within the confines of Polishness in a more rigid way. It starts again with the physical changes in the urban

space, most notably the creation of the mound, erected in 1869, celebrating the 300th anniversary of the Lublin Union, which united the Kingdom of Poland with the broader Ruthenian/Ukrainian lands and incrementally amounted to the emergence of a third political 'partner' of the Commonwealth, besides Poland and Lithuania. It transpired that its conciliatory aims missed their mark, as the Ukrainians tended to abhor the object. This marks the start of the changes made to the Lemberg space, which was hitherto more Habsburg in its character (p. 278). The author further presents the issue of new street names and monuments of famous Poles, stressing the nationalising effects of public fund-raising for the latter, along with the supportive role played here too by the city council. Later the imperial visits and celebrations are described, whereby the loyalty of the council to the Empire was intricately interwoven with the manifestation of Polish rights to the city (p. 291). Some passages are devoted to the municipal commemorative policy at the turn of the twentieth century (with many celebrations each year), which coincided with the rising Polish-Ukrainian conflict. Here the Ukrainian voice is better heard, as the author cites more extensively from articles published in *Dilo*, a Ukrainian national daily.

The chapter further examines and describes such outstanding events as the General Land Exhibition in 1894 (analysed many times in the literature), and the most important written monument testifying to the city council's heritage, i.e. the book published by the council to mark the 25th anniversary of its urban autonomy. The latter was a brilliant piece of advertisement, hallmarking the council's achievements in the field of modernising the city, educating its citizenry, and taking care of public health. Hein-Kircher points to the fact that the whole narrative was intended to support the Polish rights to the city and to show their role, virtually ignoring the Habsburg context. She does not, however, point out that the book published by the council is permeated with more implicit anti-Habsburg, independence-oriented overtones. The Polish rights to the city are also to be found in the historical discourse, in the introductory parts of the city guides, and in the overviews of the city's history, like in the case of the book by Fryderyk Pappée, presented in this work in more detail. The dramatic history of Lemberg, especially the ruinous seventeenth century, could give rise to serious arguments supporting the Polish rights to the city and the legitimisation of the turn-of-the-twentieth-century city councillors' policy. The bulwark-narrative, i.e. the patriotic role played by Lemberg in its early modern history in defence of the Commonwealth against Oriental intruders (which included not only Turks, Tartars etc., but also Cossacks, cherished by the Ruthenians/Ukrainians as their spiritual predecessors) is also traced in the historiography, which may serve as a closing motif which turns the readers again to the issue of the securitising discourse.

This comprehensive, as one may conclude, book calls into question the 'traditional' (at least in the Polish historiography) narrative of the naturalness

of Lemberg (in this instance it is better to call it Lwów) being a wholly Polish city in the nineteenth century, stressing instead the fact that it had to be made Polish, in the modern sense of the word, by means of, *inter alia*, discursive practices. It must also be stressed that it was the fear of non-Polish inhabitants, political movements and ethnic surroundings and their perception as a constant threat that helped create its specific local, and at the same time inter-regional, identity; and that it was the city council which played the major role in this. Regarding the author's choice of the 'securitisation' paradigm – while it helps a lot in forming the narration and explaining the intentions of the political actors, it is, in fact, hardly a new idea. Already in the classical books on nationhood, the motif of defending the national standing and its impact on the created *mythomoters* and the so-called *ethnicism* is evident, as in the scholarship of Anthony D. Smith. Benedict Anderson, one of the 'founding fathers' of the modernist approach to nationhood, claimed that the perceived threat against the elite was already at the foundation of the nationalising forces in the empires (chapter six of his *Imagined Communities*). Eric Hobsbawm and others also argued that the nineteenth-century national movements were conflict-oriented and that they managed and endorsed fear of the Others. Here, however, we have a book based on the whole new branch of cultural history examining securitisation practices.

The author does not thoroughly analyse the history of the Ruthenian/Ukrainian-Polish and Jewish-Polish relations in the past, which would have helped her to locate the practice of the city hosts of presenting Ruthenians as a peasant nation (e.g. at the General Exhibition of 1894) and the Jews as a threat to public health in a historical perspective, i.e. as something not new, but rather an inherently old tradition. Furthermore, the author traces how the Ruthenian/Ukrainian and Jewish discourse was marginalised and could form only a 'partly-public sphere' (p. 329), but, in my view, these communities did not have ambitions to represent the whole city and in any case would have created their own, more local, 'additional' public spheres. These communities tended to secure their own identity, following the Polish practices of hegemonic discourse (a term which does not appear in the book), so any attempts at reconciliation and proposals to form a common public sphere with the Poles would probably (this is a guess of course) have fallen on deaf ears.

All these policies, which were deemed to place Lemberg as symbolic Polish capital, did not, to be sure, put into question the fact that the city made up a part of the Habsburg Monarchy (p. 241). So one of the conclusions is that it was possible to conduct a nation-oriented policy while at the same time confirming one's own full loyalty to the empire. The book also shows that it was not only the German liberals in the Monarchy, who were secure in their commitment to the *mission civilisatrice* (a term often used in the book) by means of spreading modernity and German culture and language, conceived

of as a coherent packet. The research in question also presents the Poles as such *Kulturträger*, which gives rise to reflections about the possible patterns to which the city councillors, either implicitly or explicitly, referred. While the practices of imposing Polish culture and marginalising other ethnicities are well covered in the book and must be taken into account in further studies on Lemberg, some of them should however be treated as symptoms of a positive attitude towards the Other, especially regarding the idea of assimilation of the Jews through education, which shows that at the local level the narrative of racial fear, which was present in the Polish national-democratic ideology, did not gain ground: the Jewish votes were more important here.

In one way or another, the book offers a thorough study of Lemberg's municipal policy, presenting many facts and events – sometimes for the first time in the scholarship – and offering an overall explanation which can help to understand the urban actors and the whole phenomenon of nineteenth-century Lemberg. It is also one more case study of a Habsburg city; one which attempts to analyse the urban elites and which brings to the foreground the category of localness, which in itself is a fruitful interpretative key for further scholarship.

proofreading James Hartzell

Aleksander Lupienko

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7568-7455>

Wiktor Marzec, *Rising Subjects: The 1905 Revolution and The Origins of Modern Polish Politics*, Pittsburgh, PA, 2020, University of Pittsburgh Press, 312 pp., 25 black-and-white ills; series: Russian and East European Studies

As opposed to, for instance, the 1944 Warsaw Uprising or the Solidarity movement, the Revolution of 1905–7 does not function in the collective memory of Poles as a significant point-of-reference. The field of academic historiography, fortunately, remains autonomous (at least, to an extent) with respect to the memory politics formed by the state and tending to be increasingly biased and nationalist-oriented. Consequently, innovative elaborations on historical phenomena may add a breath of fresh air of controversy and criticism to the musty, though recipient-friendly, set of convictions regarding history. Wiktor Marzec's *Rising Subjects: The 1905 Revolution and The Origins of Modern Polish Politics*, published in 2020 by the University of Pittsburgh Press, is, no doubt, one such book. The study recklessly conceives a vision of the revolution that broke out in 'the long year 1905' and its role in the shaping of modern politics in the Polish territory.

Such issue is nothing new in this author's scholarly output: Marzec has been into the history of the 1905 Revolution for years now; the last decade

was an extremely productive time for him. Suffice it to say that he had a few dozen texts published lately, journalistic and academic, in significant historical and sociological periodicals of international reach, which dealt with various aspects of the tumultuous period in question. The work under review provides a synthesis of detailed conclusions presented in a number of recent studies. This being the case, certain aspects or threads reappear in this book, and the readers familiar with his earlier studies will certainly recognise them. This time, Marzec offers an intellectually stimulating synthesis of individual arguments, proposing interesting international comparisons and situating his considerations in a broader context of the history of imperial Russia.

The study consists of five chapters whose contents focus around the book's axial problem of how the political entities (or, as he dubs them, subjects) were formed in the course of the revolutionary occurrences of the years 1905–7. The author's particular focus is the workers participating in these events, who "were no longer the same passive imperial subjects as before. They became subjects in a completely different sense – that is, bearers of at least the potential capacity for conscious political action and self-aware participants in the social world" (p. 200).

Chapter one, provocatively entitled 'Workers and Their Intelligentsia', "focuses on historical lineages of class formation and emerging working-class intellectual life" (p. 194). Chapter two – 'Workers and the Public Sphere' – shows the process of formation of a working-class counterpublic, which produced a circulation of knowledge and social practices that was alternative to the public sphere; this, in turn, incited a "fear of the masses" among the intelligentsia. Entitled 'Speech and Action', Chapter three focuses on the political languages that competed against one another during the revolution – namely, the socialist language, on the one hand, and the language of nationalism and anti-Semitism, on the other; the latter functioned in response to the revolution. The author's reflection abounds with erudite considerations on the evolution of social and patriotic ideas and concepts (such as 'revolution', 'socialism', and more), which in 1905–7 rapidly changed their meanings.

Chapter four, 'Life and Politics', stands out against the others with its small number of theoretical references, becoming the most strongly established section of the study, in terms of source base. It namely deals with biographies of individual workers (the author quotes several narrative examples from the broader resource of such records he has amassed) who in the period concerned underwent a considerable transformation, becoming involved in the political life. Finally, in chapter five, whose title – 'The Intelligentsia and Its Workers' – is a sort of reversal of that of the first, Marzec demonstrates how the worker question turned, not without hesitation and concerns among the intelligentsia, into an essential social problem about which the press started debating at length. Let me conclude this brief discussion of the book's structure with the observation that the methodological remarks and description of the

source base placed at the end of the study, rather than (as is customary with historical books), in the introductory section, is a deft concept. Otherwise, in so many cases monographs tend to open with the least exciting fragment.

The basic body of sources on which the author has based his exploration consisted of some eight-hundred political-party leaflets from the period under discussion, targeted at the workers, plus 110 biographical notes of those who took part in the revolution. The latter include autobiographies published in the interwar period or after 1945 by the Revolution's participants in a book form, along with shorter memories, most of which were published in the press or in anniversary publications (including in the years 1955 and 1975, thus several decades after the events concerned). Moreover, the biographical notes include some unpublished memoirs from the archives of the Polish United Workers' Party (PZPR). The author declares that he only has used Polish-language records, which is perhaps somewhat awkward, given the issues addressed. References to Jewish sources (in Yiddish) could undoubtedly have enriched the study; neglecting such material should have been explained in a couple of phrases, in my opinion.

The monograph under review, rich in theoretical references (mainly from the vocabulary of sociology and political philosophy), is driven by the general postulate of quitting methodological nationalism in studies on the Revolution. As the author declares in the introduction, it is not about replacing the national context by the imperial context; instead, particular attention should be paid to the cracks inside the social and communication structure (p. 12). Such cracks, the author argues in the book's conclusion, cause that the story about the Revolution eludes "any standardized story such as that of class struggle, national revival, or political modernization" (p. 193). What is more, the book is not yet another accusation against the tsarist system: instead, a multidimensional image of the conflict between the elite and the mass emerges out of it (p. 193).

As we can learn from the introduction, the Revolution in question has no counterpart in the history of Western European countries, which paradoxically makes it a phenomenon typical of the class struggle landscape in many a region of the world: "At the same time, however, Polish politics in 1905 is worthy of study not because it offers a revealing exception but quite the contrary – a typical case. Unlike the Western bourgeoisie-led models, the Polish path exemplifies the way most of the world actually experienced political modernization. The liminal intelligentsia performed a central role, with elites grabbing with simultaneous devotion to and fear of 'the people', not unlike in Central and Southern America, the Mexican Revolution being the most notable example. If in many African or Asian contexts the situation was complicated by the colonial question and racial distinctions, it was not entirely different, with comprador vernacular elites suppressing populist attempts. For this reason, Poland is more in line with global patterns than

we often assume, with Western Europe standing apart as the odd case that requires explanation” (pp. 14–15).

As is the case with any daring academic book, also *Rising Subjects* is not free of minor breaches or conclusions that arouse doubts. My main charge against the author is that specific fragments of his book overrate the importance of the events under discussion, which manifests itself primarily in two arguments he proposes. First, I am getting doubts at hearing that the 1905 Revolution may be juxtaposed against the ‘first’ Solidarity movement to the extent that both serve as examples of “bottom-up political transformations and general democratizations in Polish history” (p. 5). As is usually the case with such (trans)historical comparisons, it is a matter of interpretative differences. To my mind, however, the proletariat of 1905 still formed a fraction of the Kingdom of Poland’s society (or, in the broader perspective, of the inhabitants of the territory of erstwhile Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth). In contrast, in post-war communist Poland, it was an enormous social stratum, which was excellently legitimised in political discourse (of the authorities as well as the opposition).

What is more, already at the threshold of the Second Republic the composition of Polish proletariat was utterly different than in the year 1905 in the Russian partition, whereas the Revolution’s veterans only formed a small part of the working class after 1918. And, since political stances in the post-1989 Poland were defined over several years by their exponents’ attitude toward the Solidarity movement and, consequently, to communist Poland, in the time of partitions modern formations emerged a dozen years before the Revolution, in the 1890s. The Revolution itself, in contrast to the Solidarity movement, did not rearrange the splits in Polish public life: it seems that it was mostly an accelerator of the tendencies which had manifested themselves earlier on in party discussions.

Second, the argument, strongly represented in the book, that the Revolution contributed to an in-depth transformation within Polish politics, neglects the fact that the events described took place in the Russian partition – specifically, in its industrialised areas, especially in Łódź. As a matter of fact, the history of Polish lands in the long nineteenth century encompassed the Prussian and Austrian partitions as well, with the histories of consecutive waves of political emigration. Each of these ‘histories’ went along a somewhat different current, and therefore the convoluted history of Poland under the partitions is not reducible to the fortunes of the Kingdom of Poland. Hence, the author’s considerations would have positively been reinforced by reminding, with use of the existing literature, the reception of revolutionary developments in Greater Poland (*Wielkopolska*) and in Galicia, and their potential influence on the situation or on political debates that went on in the two other partitions.

Marzec is moreover inclined to giving a political perspective to the events that probably never had such a dimension. To give an example, he traces the

semantic evolution of the concept of 'socialism', which, in his view, during the 1905 Revolution was more and more frequently spelt according to the period's rules of Polish spelling (namely, *soċjalizm*), rather than in its archaic form (*socyjalizm*): in the latter, the author identifies what he describes as "perhaps ... some aristocratic flavour" (p. 86). It was apparently due to the fact that the idea of socialism was becoming domesticated at that time, or rooted within the Polish political imagination. But the actual reason was, I should think, much more prosaic: with the consecutive reforms of the Polish spelling system, the form '-cya' gradually gave way to the '-cja', which is a standard nowadays.¹ Perhaps in the Revolution period, an analogous alteration might be traced for a word like *kolacja* (supper): the use of its modern spelling, instead of '*kolacya*', would not be based on a change of the dietary habits of Polish proletariat.

Finally, a handful of minor critical remarks: recapitulation of the contents of individual chapters in the conclusive section (pp. 194–7) seems to have been an unsuccessful idea: a better place for such a discussion would have been the introduction, whereas a more general synthesis of the partial conclusions should have been made part of the final remarks (excellent examples have been provided in the book's earlier parts). Contrary to what the bibliography says, Magdalena Micińska is not the editor of the trilogy on Polish intelligentsia (the actual editor being Jerzy Jedlicki), but the author of Volume 3. The bibliography contains other striking gaps, along with no less striking items to which the author refers. Among the latter is, for instance, a relatively meagre (in volume and substance terms) book by amateur historian Adrian Sekura,² whereas there are no references to Russian literature: after all, the phenomena studied by Marzec took place in the Russian Empire.

These critical remarks do not in the least relativise my high esteem of the monograph, which proposes several interesting interpretations and audacious international comparisons. It is written in beautiful English, which is not without significance to the reader's satisfaction. All in all, the study will remain an important item in the 1905 Revolution bibliography, as an obligatory point-of-reference to the other scholars embarking on an exploration of the topic. Wiktor Marzec has once again confirmed his position as a scholar of international recognition in the field of the 1905–7 events.

transl. *Tristan Korecki*

Piotr Kuligowski

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6251-0482>

¹ The hot debates around the spelling reform in the late 19th/early 20th cc. have been addressed, *inter alia*, by Edward Polański; see *idem*, 'Reformy ortografii polskiej – wczoraj, dziś, jutro', *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego*, lx (2004), 33–5.

² Adrian Sekura, *Rewolucyjni Mściciele: śmierć z browningiem w rękę* (Poznań, 2010).

Sylvia Kuźma-Markowska, *Dziecko, rodzina i płeć w amerykańskich inicjatywach humanitarnych i filantropijnych w II Rzeczypospolitej* [Children, Family and Gender Roles in American Humanitarian and Philanthropic Initiatives in Interwar Poland], Warszawa, 2018, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 419, list of abbreviations, ill., personal index, bibliog.

Humanitarian and philanthropic initiatives have received a great deal of attention in the last few years. The same can be said about the history of childhood in general. Both are in great demand. While humanitarian aid has been mostly approached through the lens of its event-oriented long history of humanitarian interventions and the history of human rights from the nineteenth century onwards, with a strong focus on wars and crises, the history of childhood is often told in conjunction with gender roles, medical, educational, or cultural history. This book combines these two – usually separately addressed – themes. It offers an important, albeit more descriptive than analytical, contribution to the historicisation of the humanitarian history of and in Eastern Central Europe – a history often vaguely represented in the narratives on the global dimensions of both issues. It tells us a story of post-war childhood and the effects of war on children and family constellations. In doing so, it seeks to contribute to the history of the gendering of the newly independent Polish state which arose after the First World War.

Focusing on some of the most famous American humanitarian and philanthropic initiatives from the interwar period, Sylvia Kuźma-Markowska discusses the American vision(s) of the proper society as well as of the gender and maternal roles that were projected on the Polish society via the humanitarian actions and aid programmes. She reflects further on the American reaction to the situation encountered in Poland, as well as on the changes that the humanitarian programmes did (or did not) trigger in Polish society. The Polish voices, and thus the Polish reaction to the American remodelling of the Polish society, have also been taken into account. The aid initiatives that serve as a foundation for the issues examined are the following: 1. The most well-known is the so-called Hoover Mission of the American Relief Administration (ARA), which operated in Poland until 1922 and provided food aid for children; 2. The second one examined is also a child food aid program, which this time was offered by the Jewish Distribution Committee (JDC, or Joint for short); 3. The next one was called the Save the Children Programme and was organised by the American Red Cross (ARC) and, separately, by Joint; 4. Support programmes for mothers formed the further described aid initiative and were carried out and administered by the ARC and the Rockefeller Foundation; 5. The final action examined is the philanthropic support for young men within the aid programme of the Young Men's Christian

Association (YMCA). All of these aid initiatives form the main outline of the narrative, even though the chapters are structured based on the groups of the needy people rather than along the lines of the initiatives as such.

The book opens with images of the Polish post-war (i.e. post-First World War) situation of children and mothers, as recalled by the American staff and presented in the American press. It thus situates the American philanthropic initiatives in the context of the (changing) American ideas of social and gender norms, and at the same time in the context of the societal and economic consequences of the First World War in Eastern Europe. The images of the Polish situation were fed by, among others, the following elements: poor health conditions; diseases; poverty; hunger; scarcity of clothing; widespread homelessness; dispossessed and stateless people (mostly Jews); alcoholism; lack of interest in family life by displaced men; begging and prostitution as a children's pathology; and a reversed and deviating distribution of gender roles. The latter applied to the (male-free) post-war situation that – as the Americans believed – forced women, mostly women from lower classes and/or from rural areas, to undertake jobs perceived as reserved for men (female labour at harvest or on construction sites). That such conditions were already widespread in the pre-war period was something that the Americans could scarcely have imagined, nor did they make an effort to understand the specifically Polish conditions. Such images were instead used to emphasise the Eastern European backwardness and, conversely, to legitimise the American aid initiatives. After all, as the Americans perceived Poland, it was a country somewhere between East and West and thus considered as in need of modernisation in the American way.

This aid, depending on its profile, was addressed to children and families in general, and was theoretically available to every needy person from the target groups. However, the values of the American middle class firmly determined its form and content (pp. 54–6). This becomes very visible in chapter two, which presents the humanitarian aid for children, as the Hoover Mission and the JDC were conducting it. In discussing how the humanitarian aid reached the children, and what ethical dilemmas the staff faced in having to classify who could and who could not benefit from the relief programmes, Kuźma-Markowska shows one of the trickiest issues concerning the American aid. The humanitarian programmes offered not only some milk or protein portions for starving children but also, if not primarily, were aimed at changing the structures of the family accordingly to the American visions, which were anything but politically and morally neutral. “Food and starvation”, Kuźma-Markowska states, “were used as a political tool ... for helping countries perceived as the future of the European democratic order” (p. 154). That this order should be based on a strong white race reflected the American theories about the importance of milk for white children and their proper development as future carriers of civilisation (p. 108). In a slightly

modified version, this racist notion could also be found in Polish society as well in relation to the Jewish population. The fact that the Hoover Mission addressed both the Christian and the Jewish children was not approved by everybody. The Polish press, for instance, condemned it and attributed the better conditions of the Jewish children to the multiple support they unfairly enjoyed, i.e. from the ARA and JDC at the same time. According to the Polish press, while the ARA distributed milk to all children, without introducing any ethnical differentiation, the JDC opened the milk bars only to Jewish children and acted discriminatorily. Neither the explanation of the situation nor the confirmation by the JDC staff that ethnic components played no role and the milk bar welcomed every child, were able to change this skewed image (p. 131–4). As a result, the JDC had a problematic start in Poland, was defamed as part of 'Judeo-Communism' [Polish: *żydokomuna*], and tolerated by Polish institutions only with a large dosage of scepticism. This went so far that an American intervention became necessary (p. 136).

Interestingly, whereas the Americans were accused of unequal treatment of Christian and Jewish children, they attributed to the Polish government some discriminatory practices and destructive policies in the eastern areas by trying to direct more American aid to Warsaw and central Poland (p. 158). Who was right is of less interest, though. The bottom line was that both the American humanitarian aid institutions and their local state partners did little to promote understanding between the increasingly conflicted ethnic and religious groups. The gap between American employees and initiatives on the one hand, and the local perceptions and local implementations on the other, was visible in almost every context of the offered aid. Some forms of aid, such as the ban on the distribution of raw food, created misunderstandings among the local population and were outrightly disregarded. The whole concept of supporting children as a separate group was foreign to many, if not most, of the societal groups in Poland. Whereas Americans defined children as the most vulnerable group, in many Polish families infants were considered to be the least important members of the family structure, as they had little to contribute to the family living situation. While this unequal perception generated many conflicts, at the same time, it introduced a new understanding of childhood in Polish society, even though its fruits could be harvested only after the Second World War.

Chapter three – 'Rebuilding a family' – focuses on the aid for (war) orphans offered by JDC and the American humanitarian aid in general, as well as on the already-established Polish practice of care for orphans. Around 1921 in Warsaw alone, 7,400 children were housed in 55 orphanages, with a further 2,400 in daytime charitable care facilities for young children deprived of a mother's care. This relatively good and enlightened situation in Warsaw was, however, not representative of the rest of the country. Moreover, not all children living in orphanages were full orphans. Some were just permanently or temporarily

left there by their families due to the insufficient financial means available to the family. Such circumstances were a far cry from the American ideal of a modern orphanage that traditionally was meant for full orphans. This gap, however, hardly resulted in a questioning of the system. Only Mason Knox, an American paediatrician and social activist, suggested that instead of continuing to invest in Polish orphanages, a new concept of care should be introduced and supported, namely foster parents. However, his idea did not catch on. The resistance on the part of Poland toward most of the American organisations' plans to redesign the Polish child care system had a simple and very pragmatic reason. This reason was called religion. Most orphanages and other forms of child care were either run by church organisations or at least strongly supported by them, and this support was too essential to risk losing it. But what characterised American Christian organizations such as Red Cross, which ended its aid to Poland in 1922 anyway, did not characterise the Jewish JDC. The latter took up the idea of the foster family and endorsed it in the form of the so-called "financial adoption". A "financial adoption" for "distant child" had been known as a concept among the transnational aid practices at least since the mid-nineteenth century, which the author, unfortunately, does not tell us, although it would be of interest for the sake of contextualisation. The mostly Christian associations initiated the "financial adoption" in order to raise support for needy children in Africa and Asia, and the Jewish aid organisations implemented it as a form of foster care during the First World War for European orphans.¹ In the twentieth century, this form was professionalised within the framework of international children's aid organisations, as propagated in Poland by "the Jewish Exponent". After the emigration laws were tightened in the USA in the early 1920s, other forms of adoption – at least forms of adoption conducted by unrelated persons – were not recognised by the immigration authorities, and so the 'financial adoption' offered a way out. As the author states, thanks to the strong maternalism of the American Jewish community, the programme has had some success. It activated many Jewish American women willing to help. Many, though not all, of the needy children raised by their impoverished mothers and grandmothers became beneficiaries. The activities of the JDC were of existential importance to the Jewish communities in Poland, which in many cases were refused local community-based support. Before the First World War, the Jewish communities had maintained their own care institutions. The war changed this situation, and now the Jewish communities became one of many competing beneficiaries of state aid. JDC's help and assistance defused the situation and benefited the Jewish communities, while at the same time making them too dependent on American aid.

¹ See e.g. Katharina Storning, 'Catholic Missionary Associations and the Saving of African Child Slaves in Nineteenth-Century Germany', *Atlantic Studies*, xiv, 4 (2017), 519–42.

Care for children went hand in hand with care for mothers, who were also cared for by the JDC, American Red Cross and Rockefeller Foundation. The main aim was to take care of pregnant women and to teach them the necessary knowledge about infant care, preferably in dedicated care stations. The recruitment of women for such care stations was everything but easy. The same applied to the professionalisation and institutionalisation of childbirth. Only a very small group of pregnant women were advised by doctors. The values that the American aid organisation sought to convey included the following: regular breastfeeding; prohibition of the addition of sedative substances such as poppy seeds; not giving soothers to children; the benefits of fresh air and clean clothes, etc.

Interestingly (but not mentioned by the author), the popularising practices (posters, organisation of children's days, proper education of young girls), as well as the contents, are strongly reminiscent of the brochures of, for instance, the Prussian activities in the fight against infant mortality among the German and the Polish populations in Prussia before the WWI. As then, so too in the American aid programmes, the popularisation of the new care standards for infants was connected with the collection of statistical data about the women and their hygienic and societal habits, as well as with the medicalisation of women's bodies. Here again, a better contextualisation and the historical setting of such practices in the longer tradition of physical and reproductive disciplining of the population would have been useful for a better historical description of the American aid, which here too remained mostly in male hands. Breastfeeding, for instance, became a scientifically regulated practice that was subject to medical control. And so the women who received such instruction were mostly women from lower and/or working classes, who ironically had mastered and integrated breastfeeding into everyday life in a much better way than the middle or upper-class women who remained outside the targeted groups (p. 259). Some aid forms that were less valued by the Americans, like for instance cribs, also remained outside of the support aid offered. Besides, American assistance for mothers consisted more of pensions and relied heavily on traditional gender roles, while maternity leave for working women became an integral part of the European system. Accordingly, the professional role of women was hardly visible and/or taken into consideration in the American initiatives in Poland. This was all the more so because the support of working women was for many Americans equated with support of communism, with its ideal of working women and social engineering (p. 278).

While children and women are the focus of the first four chapters, the last chapter is dedicated to young men and boys and the initiatives of the YMCA. The activities of the YMCA addressed the urban environment primarily. Cities were, after all, considered as unhealthy, not cultivated, and centres of depravity and the YMCA wanted to counteract this environment.

Even though membership in the Polish branch of the YMCA was reserved for Christian men only, Christian women were allowed to use the infrastructure, although they were regarded as a source of fleshly pleasures, attributed guilt and instrumentalised. The YMCA was generally speaking very differentiating and exclusive, and not only in terms of gender. The affiliation with certain classes was decisive and could have a separating effect. The same applied to religion. While religious preferences, as long as they were Christian, theoretically played less of a role, nonetheless the Polish Catholic Church accused the organisation of having a Protestant character. Whatever the case, the pedagogical philosophy focused on both bodily enhancement and on strengthening the mind through sport, as was already the case with the social hygienists before the First World War. Unfortunately, the conceptual and institutional connection to eugenics and (European) social hygiene ideas is hardly mentioned, which is a pity given their conceptual proximity to the narrative of the need for healthy and ethnically-pure Polish bodies in the shaping of the Polish nation. This is in general one of the main flaws of the book – the study would undoubtedly have benefited from a stronger and better historical contextualisation and from embedding the American aid concepts and its Polish expressions within transnational trends. Another aspect, unfortunately also little illuminated, is that of the “railway centres”. The YMCA tried to educate and generate a new class of leaders.

Interestingly, not only soldiers and young men were considered as the future of such a project, but also the railway people. They were considered as a local intelligentsia. Railroad stations, with their electricity, libraries, restaurants etc., were regarded as cultural centres for the peripheral regions, especially the eastern peripheral regions. This is a very interesting, though not well explained aspect, worthy of more attention considering the historical importance of “railway people” for many transformation processes in the nineteenth century, including state-building, population policy, medical control, etc.²

To conclude, Sylwia Kuźma-Markowska’s study is worth reading as a contribution to the history of American humanitarian aid in interwar Poland. However, it mainly ignores theoretically-fuelled analyses. In the introductions, the proposed questions are too factual in nature and description-oriented, and they do not go much beyond providing empirical information. The portrayal of the transfer of the American politicised societal visions and their implementation on Polish soil starts and ends with its characterisation. While it is a very detailed characterisation, it is nevertheless more a depiction than

² See e.g. Angelika Strobel, ‘Creating the “Railway Population”: Public Health and Statistics in Late Imperial Russia’, in Heike Karge, Friederike Kind-Kovács, and Sara Bernasconi (eds), *From the Midwife’s Bag to the Patient’s File: Public Health in Eastern Europe* (Budapest, 2017), 51–72.

an attempt to use it as an angle of analysis for an original interpretation, either of interwar gender dynamics (as the title might suggest) or of the entangled Polish-American relationship. The latter is all the more surprising given that the humanitarian aid can be seen as a harbinger and/or extension of US-foreign policy. However, descriptions and examinations outside the Polish conditions are rarely, if ever, given. The same applies to the distinction between Polish and Eastern European experiences, although it is at least referred to here and there. It would further be interesting to know to what extent the American ideas were adopted and/or discussed by the Polish government and the Polish state welfare institutions, or to what extent they remained isolated and selective. Despite this criticism and the book's lack of a substantial impact on the contemporary scholarship on gender roles and/or the history of global humanitarian aid so far, the work nevertheless constitutes a solid, detailed, and well-researched foundation for further theoretical analyses.

proofreading James Hartzell

Justyna Aniceta Turkowska

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7254-2453>

Piotr Cichoracki, Joanna Dufurat, and Janusz Mierzwa, *Oblicza buntu społecznego w II Rzeczypospolitej doby wielkiego kryzysu (1930–1935). Uwarunkowania, skala, konsekwencje* [Faces of Social Protest in the Second Polish Republic during the Great Depression (1930–1935). Preconditions, Scale, Consequences], Kraków, 2019, Towarzystwo Wydawnicze “Historia Iagellonica”, 618 pp., 30 ills

How, in the aftermath of fallen Marxist-Leninist orthodoxies and amid patriotic-nationalist enthusiasm for the non-communist Polish past, should empirically reliable, interpretively sober historiography understand interwar Poland at its economically most painful moment, during the great depression of 1930–5? This deeply researched and rigorously conceptualised book, despite its disproportion of empirical reportage to argument and explanation, engages a fundamental question: “society’s attitude [Polish: *postawa*] toward the Second Republic (including from the perspective of September 1939)” (p. 245). Judging existing historical literature, despite its occasional virtues, “unsatisfactory”, the authors boldly claim (in their characteristic scientific-bureaucratic prose), that their book “in essential [*istotny*] manner, fills out [*uzupełnia*] and verifies the state of our knowledge of society in the Second Republic, the functioning of its state structures, and its social organisation” (p. 22).

Its method is aggregated analysis of 828 incidents of *bunt społeczny* throughout Poland in 1930–5, a periodisation the authors justify both in economic

terms – as the great depression’s high tide – and by the regime change that followed Marshal Józef Piłsudski’s death. While the term *bunt* suggests “revolt” or “uprising”, the authors’ use of it translates to “spontaneous social protest”, with readiness among participants to employ violence against civil and military authorities, but not organised, led, and planned from above by leadership groups (p. 15). The authors, addressing Wiktor Marzec’s influential account of the 1905 revolution and its consequences (*Rising Subjects: The 1905 Revolution and The Origins of Modern Polish Politics* [2020]), mildly object that recent historiography on the lower classes “sometimes does not appreciate changes in their situation” – whether in the interwar years or in the twentieth century generally – “in the context of their periodically heightened activity and radicalisation of attitude”. The authors would like to know, too, how social protest generated “evolution in the ruling elites’ views and corresponding modifications of state policy” (pp. 23–4) – although, in the end, they cannot show that popular pressure had important effects of this sort. The book’s sources, drawn widely from Polish, Ukrainian, and Belorussian archives, prove the strength of the seldom-studied reportage by provincial governors [*województwo*] on everyday affairs outside the big cities [*Polska powiatowa*], whose inhabitants’ attitudes “largely delineated the Second Republic’s face” (p. 20).

‘Contexts’, the first of four chapters, all lengthy, rests heavily on existing economic and political literature, much from the pre-1989 decades. About Piłsudski’s post-1926 *Sanacja* or “purification regime”, which had emerged in more authoritarian form from its repressive confrontation in 1930 with Centre-Left opponents, the authors emphasize its strategies for “depoliticising” Polish society. The non-communist political opposition, chastened by the 1930s confinement of its leaders in the “place of seclusion” [*miejsce odosobnienia*] or political concentration camp of Bereza Kartuska, found its access to bureaucratic posts and the public stage hindered by myriad administrative prohibitions and increasingly intrusive press censorship. The regime’s goal was, in ideologist Adam Skwarczyński’s words, “capitalisation for future development through the sacrifice of lowered living standards”, justified by “an ideal of austerity [*surowość*] in life and customs” (p. 357).

Yet, surveying the left and right opposition – the peasant-based parties, the socialists, the mushrooming radical-right Camp of Great Poland [*Obóz Wielkiej Polski* – OWP] – the authors conclude that none in these years actively sought the regime’s overthrow (p. 186). The clandestine communist movement, its ranks swelling toward 30,000, pursued with little success a tactic of channelling spontaneous social protest toward itself. Instead of entertaining megalomaniac thoughts of toppling the *Sanacja*, Poland’s Communist Party [*Komunistyczna Partia Polski* – KPP] anticipated war, until the Polish-Soviet non-aggression treaty of 1932, and then Hitler’s accession to power the next year (which diminished the financial and other aid Polish communists

received from German comrades), turned them toward the Comintern's 1935 United Front line. In general, the authors locate the peak of plebeian radicalism in 1933, before it revived – problematically for the authors' periodization – in 1936–7.

Chapter two, 'Social Protest', delivers the findings of their deep-probing research. In harmony with the rich Western European and North American literature on the history of widespread violence against the state and upper-class elites, as summed up in the widely read books of historical sociologist Charles Tilly, the authors distinguish between its "archaic" and "modern" manifestations. Modern were the period's 3,915 industrial strikes, of which only 27 qualified as *bunt społeczny*. The strikes occurred primarily in Poland's west and centre, where industrialisation had occurred, and expressed workers' organisations protests against wage cuts and layoffs. A rarity was the one-day agricultural labourers' strike in western Poland of April 1932, protesting official efforts to lower day-wages and employers' efforts to import cheap field labour from Poland's east. Organised by the Polish Socialist Party and other anti-*Sanacja* forces, it won its wage demands (p. 172). Such was the reward of the former Prussian partition area's "higher level of political culture" (p. 301). Peasants' efforts in Galicia (Małopolska) and the eastern borderlands (*Kresy*) to withhold their products from local markets, in protest against hated urban marketing taxes, or to reverse falling commodity prices, very commonly failed, and sometimes descended into bloody conflict with the police, or anti-Jewish plundering.

Protests of the unemployed, mostly urban and centre-west, numbered about twenty per cent of all incidents. They witnessed disorder and violence over inadequate or non-existent money grants and public provisions of food and fuel. An additional thirty per cent of incidents the authors classify as political, very many occurring in 1930. Communists or "crypto-communists" [*PPS-Lewica, Sel-Rob*] often sought to steer these protests, which erupted from opposition to local-level administrative-police oppression or to the *Sanacja* regime's repression of its political challengers. Typically they burned out rapidly, failing to burgeon into regime-overthrow.

"Archaic" protest flared among Galician villagers and, in the *Kresy*, Belorussian and Ukrainian peasants. Its most dramatic expression occurred in June 1932 among Greek Catholic villagers near Lesko, one of the country's "poorest and most civilisationally backward [*cywilizacyjnie zapóźnione*] areas" (p. 165). Summoned to perform unpaid communal roadwork, the cry arose that "the lords" were attempting to reintroduce compulsory feudal labour services [*pańszczyzna*], as everyone would see when manorial henchmen dug up the churchyard memorial crosses erected in 1848, when the Austrian *Robot* was abolished, under which the documents verifying the hated servile labour's abolition were, in a Christian manner (as it was imagined) buried. Crowds of thousands surged, overwhelming police controls. Official

repudiations of repressive intent availed nothing. Violence erupted, but without deaths. Many were arrested, some jailed. Ukrainian political leaders lamented among themselves that “the Ukrainian people had shown themselves in these places to be very benighted and incapable of self-government [(narodem) *bardzo ciemnym i niezdolnym do żadnego samorządu*]” (p. 168).

The authors highlight the “endemic violence” [*przemocowość*] they suppose pervaded village society, and the “brutality of rural criminality”, often visited, sometimes atrociously, on hated policemen. In six years of social protest, seven policemen were murdered, several hundred wounded (pp. 271, 279, 309). Polish rural society’s “low political culture” embodied the partition era’s legacy of suspicion and antagonism toward civil authorities and police. The distinction between “one’s own” [*swojskość*] and “the outsiders” [*obcość*] was sovereign. A collective sense of injustice could fire the coals of resentment under the villagers’ skin, “yet calm and apathy could quickly follow” (p. 162).

Rural social protest peaked in repeated armed clashes of Polish villagers with police and army in central Galicia in 1932–3, sparked by outrage over the government’s relentless taxation and sequestrations for unpaid taxes, and by resentment at the *Sanacja* regime’s repression of the peasant party [*Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe* – PSL]. Here the government lost control of some areas to armed peasant bands – as had happened in 1918–19 and on several occasions in the nineteenth century. The book views these dramatic episodes from afar. Here, as elsewhere in its pages, there is next to no first-person testimony from the villages, while the ruling elites speak more through their writings than in their own voices. This seems to be the consequence of a (legitimate but self-hobbling) structuralist-positivist conception of historiography more focused on determining empirical truths *ex post facto* than on capturing, conveying, and interpreting the subjective experience of historical agents.

After surveying the roughly twenty per cent of social protests erupting over government policy, mainly in Galicia and the east, seeking completion of the nineteenth-century separation of manorial and village property rights and unification of scattered peasant fields into single holdings, the authors conclude, on a mildly triumphant note, that their researches “undermine the myth of peasant revolt [*bunt chłopski*] in the 1930s that figured in the literature on the subject before 1989” (p. 146). This judgment would gain persuasiveness if the authors cited characteristic instances in pre-1989 historiography that plainly reveal the tendentiousness they allege. It may be, too – as this review will propose – that the authors’ own findings call their claim into question.

Similarly in chapter 3, analysing ‘the state’, the authors characterise the older literature’s view of Polish officialdom as disfigured – here they cite Janusz Żarnowski’s 1973 words – by “servility, a tactical and amoral approach to life, lack of intellectual independence, conservatism, [and] emphasis on their own alleged superiority” (p. 234). By contrast, the authors, in the book’s

conclusion, declare that “overall appraisal of the administration, in general, proves rather positive” (p. 450). They concede that the police often acted with brutality, especially against suspected communists, who were sometimes tortured with electric shocks, and against armed Belorussian and Ukrainian borderland forest bands. Yet, in general, police and civil administrators “really [*naprawdę*] did do a lot to avoid clashes”, adding that “authority [*władza*] does not like corpses” (though sometimes it does) (p. 263).

Of the judiciary, the authors (delicately) find “grounds” [*przestanki*] for pre-1989 charges that courts sentenced peasants more harshly than others, especially before emergency tribunals [*sądy doraźne*] (pp. 310–12). As for the army, the older literature exaggerated the number of soldiers deployed against social protesters when, as sometimes happened, police units were overwhelmed. In truth, army units numbered but 600–1,100 – seemingly vast forces still (p. 341). Like the book’s preceding chapters, this one offers no conclusions, but let its factual findings speak for themselves.

By contrast, the final chapter, ‘Repercussions’, opens with an ambitious declaration: “social unrest [*niepokoje*] could be viewed as symptoms of defects in the functioning of the state” (p. 357). The authors concluded that the *Sanacja* regime throughout the six depression years “felt threatened by hostile crowds, even fear” (pp. 360–1). Though the administration believed it was containing and diminishing social protest, the “occasionally massive character of its repression leaves as an open question the effectiveness of pro-governmental political structures’ actions” (p. 363). The Ministry of Interior sought to improve its crowd control methods, but even as the depression slowly abated, forty-three protestors were killed in strike tumults in 1936 and forty more in the August 1937 PSL-steered peasant strike. Judgment must therefore be “restrained [*wstrzemięźliwe*]” (p. 383).

Official censorship massively suppressed reportage, even in government-friendly publications, of social protest and government repression of it, mainly – but not only – when it occurred among the non-Polish populations of the eastern borderlands. Government hostility struck the oppositional political parties variously. The PSL suffered defeat and demoralization through the Galician crackdowns of 1930 and 1932–3, causing subsequent defections to the pro-government camp. The PPS cleaved defensively to tactics of legality, fearful not only of government reprisals but that communists operating in the shadows would steer radicalized socialists into their own ranks. The nationalist camp [*obóz narodowy*] focused on urban issues and, increasingly, antisemitic actions at the universities and elsewhere. The authors find that, overall, it was the Right that provoked the most sustained anti-governmental protest in these years. Ukrainian nationalists staged bloody attacks in 1934–5, but the authors, while offering considerable detail on their activities and those of communists in the Belorussian districts, avoid including their actions, politically steered from above – though the extent of Soviet direction remains unclear – in the

category of *bunt społeczny*. Jewish public opinion embitteredly charged police with passivity in the face of antisemitic riots, “but certainly for the most part unjustly [*niesłusznie*]” – “certainly” a contestable judgment (p. 416).

As for the communists, the authors’ lengthy discussions of them mainly highlight their weakness and lack of effective action in mobilising either peasants or workers. From 1933 they abjured following a revolutionary line, having realised that a “condition of [societal] tension” was not the same as “revolutionary ferment”, and that state coercion had forced villagers, “both kulaks and impoverished”, into obediently paying their taxes (pp. 425, 427). The Soviet project induced some eastward flights across the Polish border among non-Polish groups in the *Kresy*, as well as loyalty among borderland forest bands which fought some bloody frays with the police and army. But in 1931 a Belorussian communist reported that the peasantry feared urgings to organise themselves. “They say right away: yes, you want to pull us into the *komuna*, so that then you can take away what we still have” (p. 152).

Antisemitism does not loom large in this book. The authors’ definition of social protest excludes pre-planned right-wing actions against Jewish-owned businesses and Jewish students, even though they risked – and even welcomed – the outbreak of anti-Jewish violence. An “uprising against the Jews” in March 1933 in Małopolska’s Żywiec region, even though traceable to OWP and Hallerite provocation, would have been a fit subject for an in-depth analysis, but is only mentioned in passing. The book’s periodisation relieves the authors of having to account for the rising extremism of Judeophobic politics and street actions after Piłsudski’s death.

Instead, chapter four concludes with a section entitled ‘After 1939’, introduced with the observation that the collapse of the Polish state could “theoretically activate a reckoning” with the government’s dealing with social protest in the 1930–5 years (p. 435). Yet, the authors decline this option, turning instead to the post-war communist regime’s prosecution, under the 1946 law on “responsibility for the September defeat and fascisation of state life”, of various individuals, among whom a number survived their punishments to follow successful careers in the People’s Republic.

It falls to the book’s seven-page ‘Conclusion’ to weigh the overall significance of its findings. Initially, reticence prevails: “The data sets we have assembled can only be the starting point for interpretive propositions, without, however, offering a chance of unequivocal judgments and conclusions” (p. 445). The authors propose to confine themselves to but two aspects of their findings – the geographical sweep and number of incidents of social protests uncovered by their researches. This leads only to the recapitulation of previously presented and unsurprising material.

Yet the authors do break free of their self-imposed fetters to insist that the hundreds of incidents of spontaneous protest and violence they charted show no progress towards inter-class or inter-ethnic cooperation against the

regime, but “just the opposite:” clash of interests between village and town, unemployed and jobless, “one’s own” and “the outsiders” (p. 448). Nor could the oppositional political parties cooperate against the *Sanacja*: Endeks/OWP, PPS, SL did not support social protests that corresponded to constituencies other than their own; the regime never faced a united opposition.

On the macro- or nationwide level, social protest never broke through prevailing “social passivity”. The authors quote approvingly the Endek publicist Juliusz Zdanowski’s late 1932 diary entry: “society’s declining interest in matters of the highest importance, its lack of reaction, are astonishing. The conviction that it is all up to the government, which is responsible for everything, spreads across the country like chloroform” (pp. 449–50). Later, as the post-1935 regime fractured into contending factions, immobilizing fear arose within its ranks that, in a crisis, the system would break down. As in 1936 social protest sparked bloody repression of worker protests on the streets of Lviv and Cracow, repeated again in the massive Peasant Strike of 1937, the prospects for social peace that had glimmered in 1934–5 faded. The book’s last lines are these: “The *Sanacja* camp showed itself incapable of formulating a program containing elements of an authentic compromise with the postulates of the opposition. The years 1936–9 proved that, from a perspective encompassing the whole interwar period, this was an enduring incapability” [*niezdolność trwała*] (p. 451).

These conclusions force recognition that the book needed to extend its substantive, documentation-based analysis beyond the 1930–5 years to 1939. The escalation of antisemitic radicalism and violence after 1935, together with the regime’s armed bloodletting in urban streets and on country roads, all qualify variously as social protest and its repression – that is, as a heightening of the tensions that permeated the preceding quinquennium. If the authors reply that they aimed to test pre-1989 historiographical claims that the economically defined great depression years generated a pre-revolutionary scenario, they did not develop a line of argumentation that remained fixed on this proposition. Nor, on their own showing, did pre-1989 historiography insist very firmly on the pre-revolutionary thesis.

The reader of this review will recognize the book’s impressive empirical accomplishments, and the light they throw on 1930s Poland, especially on *Polska powiatowa*. If the authors’ intention was to establish a post-communist foundation for appraising social protest and government response in the *Sanacja* years, they succeeded within the chronological limits they imposed on themselves. Reflecting on the broad conclusions they drew about Piłsudski’s regime, one realises they have not fundamentally changed the picture of the era received from professionally responsible and empirically scrupulous pre-1989 historiography. The *Sanacja*, despite the integrity of many officials, was a burgeoning dictatorship unable to restrain repression and bloodshed at critical moments of social protest. It was a regime, beyond its industrialising

ambitions, steering toward no positive, socially integrative future. As for the common people, the analysis of whose resistance to the government is the book's major virtue, in a land with only some 1.5 million workers in modern industry, the multitudinous rest, mostly small farmers and rural workers, were in the majority encumbered by the burden of their inherited demotic cultures – fixated on ancient resentments, ill-acquainted with modernity, all too tempted to inhabit a peasant utopia in which the state and its officials vanished from the earth.

William W. Hagen

<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8383-3080>

Iwona Dadej, *Beruf und Berufung transnational: deutsche und polnische Akademikerinnen in der Zwischenkriegszeit*, Osnabrück, 2019, fibre Verlag, 357 pp., appendix, bibliog., index; series: Einzelveröffentlichungen des DHI Warschau, 38

Iwona Dadej, a historian associated with the Centre for Historical Research in Berlin and the Warsaw-based Institute of History, both under the aegis of the Polish Academy of Sciences, has been exploring the women's movement, the gender order and relations in the world of science, and transnational connections between women's organisations in the former half of the twentieth century for several years. The monograph under review comes as a result of this research, based on her doctoral thesis submitted at the Freie Universität Berlin and analyses the areas of activity of women with a university-level education background and their strivings for recognition and equal rights in the scientific and professional life of the Weimar Republic and the Second Republic of Poland.

The study follows the lines of comparative history, combining analysis of the structures and examination of mutual connections and transnational flows and inspirations. Gender history is at the centre of Dadej's research, firmly rooted in German feminist historiography and in the analytical categories elaborated by authors such as Karin Hausen or Gisela Bock. It combines, in an innovative manner, reflection on the global and local dimension of the women's movement, with all sensitivity to the decisions and individual strategies of its activists. The book's clear, 'Chinese box' structure is respectable. The proposed, well thought-over analysis begins with the international level and reflection on the activities of the International Federation of University Women [IFUW], through the middle level of national organisations – namely, the Deutscher Akademikerinnenbund [DAB] and the Polish Association of Women with Higher Education [PSKzWW], up to the case studies. The latter cover two female juridical milieus and their professional associations which strove for equal status in the public and state life.

On the one hand, such a structure enables to look at the women's movement in terms of a transnational 'intellectual project' (p. 43), whilst on the other, it enables a systematic comparison of the organisations, agendas, and reciprocal influence in two socio-cultural contexts. While the study tilts at times toward the Polish case, this does not make the reading disturbed; comparative studies rarely tend to be ideally symmetrical. The proposed multi-aspect analysis produces, in effect, a group portrait of female pioneers in the world of science, who were active citizens of their two respective nation-states.

The research into the history of women developed in Polish historiography since the 1990s basically focus on local developments, rarely comparing Polish women's movement against those in the other countries and setting it in a broad European, if not global, context. An enormous value of the study is that it turns toward transnational forms of the movement's activities and postulates, the multidirectional flows of concepts and ideas which have been inspiring the women's organisations' activities, a hundred years ago as well as today, themselves getting transformed in local, regional and global contexts. Thus, the book under review extends the scope of research on Polish feminist movement by adopting new perspectives, while also opening the studies in (Central) European activities of women in the field of science towards new nation-related perspectives.

The monograph is composed of five chapters, a summary, and an extensive annex. Chapter one introduces the subject-matter and the study's structure, thoroughly discusses the records and sources used and the research methods adopted; described is also the constructivist approach underlying the comparison. The author's effort put into reconstruction of the women's associations' activities: for both Poland and Germany, the documentation related to the organisations concerned has been highly damaged, while most of the women active in the scientific and social field left no ego-documents. In her analysis of the source material gathered, Dadej demonstrates a high awareness of the narrative strategies used by the protagonists as well as the (female) historiographers of the women's movement. When reconstructing, in the further chapters, the history of activities of higher-educated women in the international and national soil, the author remains sensitive to the myths accrued around the organisations under discussion – to mention the one of self-dissolution of DAB at the moment the Nazis came to power in Germany (pp. 186–7).

Chapter two draws the historical context of the actions and activities of the women's movement in the interwar period and its social anchoring. Most of the women with academic education who were active between the two World Wars had an educated family background: they were born, respectively, to families of Polish intelligentsia, the stratum that was formed in the latter half of the nineteenth century, or to the families of German *Bildungsbürgertum*,

firmly rooted in the Enlightenment tradition. The women socialised in these milieus shared their values and dispositions, such as the cult of education and knowledge and a sense of uniqueness/elitist character. Polish women appreciated the vocation for social work, rooted in the Positivist thought. Describing the activists' background, Dadej resorts to Pierre Bourdieu's sociological categories of habitus and capitals – pointing, however, to the fact that the male-dominated culture formed the models of behaviour and thinking, the research on habitus usually remaining blind to the importance of gender in the formation of an environment's norms. The author's question of how the university women's habitus was formed, and how their socialization evolved (frequently pursued at homes with an academic tradition), is fascinating. Did the women entering the world of science take over the attitudes and rituals of their fathers, professors and colleagues, or did they negotiate them within a socially constructed gender? Dadej regrettably gives only a partial answer to these questions (I will resume this point below).

Chapter three focuses on the history of emergence and practices of the International Federation of University Women, an umbrella women's organisation whose efforts were joined by Polish and German associations of women with an academic background. Dadej demonstrates how IFUW, closely cooperating with the League of Nations, became an essential point of reference for them. In building the structures of their own organisations, the activists from Berlin and Warsaw strongly oriented themselves to the international federation whilst, at the same time, negotiating its binding concepts and practices and adapting them to the local, national conditions. IFUW was namely heavily dominated by Anglo-Saxon models since activists from the United States and the United Kingdom played the first fiddle in it. Moreover, the purposes of the women's movement were gradually internationalised, and an international scientific community of women was getting formed within the Federation, while activists from different countries pursued their own cultural and scientific diplomacies there, thereby often serving their respective national interests. The female scientists' rootedness in a local, national cultural context, while in parallel striving for building a transnational community, is described by Dadej as a 'national internationalism' (p. 192). These activists made use of their international activity domestically as well, as a capital in their fight for equal status and prestige in public life. In her reconstruction of the actions of Polish and German women within IFUW and analysis of the structures and practices of the umbrella organisation, the author explores the national splits and unveils the framework of colonial thinking and relations between the European centre and the peripheries. One excellent example is English and French functioning as the dominant languages at the meetings and sessions; organisations from East Central Europe appeared at the conventions under their translated names, while the German members of the Federation fought a long battle for recognition of German as an official conference language.

On the one hand, IFUW supported the policy of European reconciliation and advocated pacifistic ideas, while on the other, its activists were familiar with national resentments that tore the post-Versailles Europe.

Chapter four offers a thorough comparison of two organisations banding women with university education on nation-state level – the German DAB, active between 1926 and mid-1930s, and the Polish PSKzWW, active from 1926 to 1939. Dadej describes how the organisations came through, their methods of action, connection networks, and the figures of their founders. The proposed analysis, pointing to a grassroots model of setting up of the German organisation and a top-down initiative in the case of its Polish counterpart, might be a contribution to the reflection on the role of the state in East Central European modernisation processes. Dadej points moreover to the close relations between PSKzWW activists and Polish state authorities and institutions in the practice of the organisation's functioning. The actions of the women's movement's exponents appeared in the context of the attempts to build a soft power of the interwar Poland, an excellent example of which was the organisation of the IFUW Congress in Cracow in 1936. At this point, a question would be worth posing about the attitude of the activists of the emancipative civic movement towards the authoritarian trends accruing in the *Sanacja* camp, which was in power since the May coup of 1926. Much more light could also be shed on the attitude of German female activists to the Nazi movement and the totalitarian order taking shape after 1933.

A particularly valuable fragment in this part of the study is the extensive analysis of scientific bibliographies of studies written by female authors, compiled in both countries, and of the periodicals dealing with the 'women's question'. These breakdowns were an essential instrument for women in their positioning themselves in the field of science and in the shaping of a female scientific tradition and memory of the feminist movement. The author carefully analyses the transfers of knowledge and ideas, showing the idea of feminist bibliography as a travelling concept – the category that has recently gained popularity in the reflection on the humanities, originally taken from a study by Mieke Bal.¹ Pursued on the international level, the idea of scientific elaboration was deeply filtered in Berlin and Lwów (Lviv, Lemberg) by, respectively, the German and Polish historiographic traditions, translated into the local conditions, and enriched by its advocates' own ideas.

Chapter five focuses on the generation of the first Polish and German female lawyers who were members of the professional organisations, the Association of Women with a Degree in Law and the Deutscher Juristinnenverein. Dadej broadly discusses the educational paths of these women, which led through West European universities, particularly the one in Zurich. Further on, she outlines the dimensions of women's involvement in law activities before

¹ Mieke Bal, *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities. A Rough Guide* (Toronto, 2002).

1918, primarily focusing on the tradition of German counselling. The chapter mostly covers, however, potential and limitations to the employment of woman with a degree in law in the judiciary, attorney office of the State Attorney, the Bar, or the notary public institution of the Polish Second Republic or the Weimar Republic. Since German women formally gained access to the law-related professions in the early 1920s, while their Polish counterparts had to seek to be allowed to act as judges for a much longer time, this part of the study mostly focuses on Polish female circles' endeavours for recognising their competencies and status. What Dadej does is emphasise the expert character of the involvement of women educated in law in the debates that went on within the women's movement and their participation in legal discussions on the nationality of married women, or the legal status of illegitimate children.

The study ends with a brief summary, listing the major conclusions based on the research conducted. There are annexes, giving basic information on women's organisations, their membership, and forms of action. The addenda include biographical notes of the leading activists, compositions of the organisations concerned and their local branches (as reconstructed by the author) and present facts of importance regarding both associations. This encyclopaedic section is worth appreciating, as are the pretty detailed descriptions of the emergence and structures of both organisations given earlier in the text. As regards the groups whose histories were neglected by the traditional historiography and then long pushed to the peripheries, determination of the basic facts and restoring the names of the forgotten female activists is a fundamental effort, being of key importance to regaining the history of women in the collective memory.

Beruf und Berufung ... is a well-structured comparative history which may serve as a model to follow by researchers wrestling with the difficulties in comparative studies and transnational research. The unique perspective forms a vital contribution to the research into Polish women's movement. Yet, the study leaves a bit to be desired as far as analysis of political aspects of university women, both on the European and national level, is concerned. The author points to close cooperation between IFUW and the League of Nations and to the similar objectives and values of both organisations, which were oriented to international cooperation and peace-promoting actions. However, she never mentions the weakening position of the League during the twenty Interbellum years and never asks how this might have affected the activities of a women's federation. What is more, both Germany and Poland distanced themselves from the League's decisions and actions, and hence it would be worth getting to know what attitude was assumed by the women active in the international arena, who received subventions from their ministries of foreign affairs. Again, there is not much we can learn about the political colouring of the women's organisations' actions in the national soil.

While the author does mention the tensions appearing between the women associated with various political and ideological circles in Poland, she gives no details in this matter. Most PSKzWW activists were reportedly associated, in one way or the other, with the ruling *Sanacja* camp. The latter, however, had its diverse tints and tones; after 1935, the tension between the *Sanacja's* left and right wing intensified. We would not learn from the book under review, though, how the women from the circles or milieus under analysis oriented themselves in the political map of the Polish Second Republic. Such orientations must have translated to their life stories as scholars and in career terms, particularly as regards the otherwise broadly-discussed organisation of female lawyers. In the 1930s, Polish solicitor self-government became an area of the offensive of radical rightist lawyers' organisations, which strove for excluding their Jewish colleagues. In 1938, the Polish Minister of Justice resolved to close the lists of lawyers, which strongly affected primarily the young entrant lawyers (both male and female), especially trainee solicitors (of both sexes) from Jewish families. How did the female lawyers respond? Did they express their opinion in this matter? In what ways did these developments affect their equal status endeavours? Again, no such questions are posed in the book.

The issue of anti-Semitism is absent, though the author otherwise takes note of the tensions between Polish and Ukrainian university women's organisations. In the German academic circles, the conservative, chauvinistic, and anti-Semitic currents remained strong. Were the women leaving the German tertiary schools free of such convictions? Was an organisation with as many as 3,600 members ideologically monolithic? The author would not tell us anything about the political sympathies of the German female academicians. Questions about their political socialisation are not posed, either, for Polish higher schools and student circles, which particularly in the thirties yielded themselves to rightist radicalisation. The political problems might certainly have sufficed to compile a separate book; on the other hand, the depleted corpus of sources might appear not-quite-gracious as far as an ideological portrait of the women's organisations goes. When it comes to discussing the women's battle for a position in the professional and public life, particularly if polarised like the one in the interwar period, it is difficult to escape such questions. The book under review would undoubtedly be more valuable, had these issues been at least indicated.

Something to be desired is also left by certain interesting theoretical and analytical tropes employed but not fully used in the research. Such is the case, for instance, with the category of habitus (appearing in chapter two), which points to an important dimension of identification of university women with specified social groups and to socialisation in terms of professional and public roles. Yet, the concept is not used to more broadly describe the milieus to which the female activists owed their formation, or as a tool with which to analyse the biographies of women in more depth further on in the

book. There are no micro-historical examples which would have shown the dispositions formed up, attempts at negotiating the legacy models, or instances of transgressive behaviour.

None of these reservations, though, is meant to diminish the importance of the monograph in question. The book by Iwona Dadej offers some extraordinarily inspiring analytical categories and interpretative propositions of essential importance to the further development of research on women's movement in Poland and Central Europe. The study primarily offers an innovative comparative concept and significantly contributes to the studies on national, international and transnational dimensions of female circles' activities in the two decades between the World Wars. Through the prism of gender history, it shows the process of emergence of a global field of science whilst at the same time reminding us about the importance of social organisations as agents and space of exchange of thought and experience. It should be hoped that the author's findings will circulate across the borders, once the book gets translated into Polish and English.

transl. *Tristan Korecki*

Iza Mrzyglód

<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7312-9361>

Anna Bikont, *Sendlerowa. W ukryciu* [Irena Sendler. In Hiding], Wołowiec, 2017, Wydawnictwo Czarne, 480 pp., bibliog., photog., index of persons; series: Biografie

Journalist and author, Anna Bikont is a leading figure in Polish historical reportage. She was part of the *Tygodnik Mazowsze*, a key weekly of the underground 'Solidarity' movement and democratic opposition in the last years of communist Poland, from its first till last issue. She co-founded *Gazeta Wyborcza*, East Central Europe's largest daily newspaper after 1989. Her book *My z Jedwabnego* (published in English under the title *The Crime and the Silence: Confronting the Massacre of Jews in Wartime Jedwabne*) was awarded the *Polityka* weekly's historical prize and the prestigious European Book Prize.

The central character of Bikont's new book is Irena Sendler (Sendlerowa), née Krzyżanowska (1910–2008), the legendary figure in the pantheon of Polish twentieth-century heroes and a symbol of Polish 'Righteous Among the Nations'. Under the Nazi German occupation, using the alias 'Jolanta', she formed, together with her associates, a sort of clandestine clan that found out dwellings for their wards – the Jewish children entrusted by their parents to Poles. The team was mostly formed of women, most of whom were affiliated to leftist formations. An excellent example to the contrary is Jadwiga Piotrowska, a secondary heroine who is almost forgotten nowadays: as we can learn from the book, the merits of this right-believing Catholic

woman, who wanted to convert the entrusted children to Christianity, were no lesser than those of Irena Sendler herself.

The book is composed of twenty mini-essays illustrating different stages in Irena's life and the key episodes in Poland's twentieth-century history. Irena's intellectual and ideological formation is dealt with quite at length: in her early youth, Krzyżanowska was pushed toward the Left by the fact that socialists and communists treated Jews as co-citizens equal in rights. Later on, Irena wrote of herself thus: "Rather than a doctrine and political programme, socialism meant before the war a certain type of social sensitivity and objection to the cult of money" (p. 85). Such affiliations were not political party-oriented but rather community or milieu-related; many of the book's characters were graduates of the schools run by Helena Radlińska, an outstanding leftist activist and pedagogue; others were taught at the Left-oriented Free Polish University (*Wolna Wszechnica Polska*). With the tragedy of the Holocaust, the attitude towards the Jews and anti-Semitism became for Irena one of the fundamental criteria of evaluating the socio-political realities.

The narrative is not linear; facts from the Nazi occupation time, and the pre-war years, often recur: the author deems these experiences to have been formative for Irena and her circle. After the war, Irena Sendler joined the Polish Workers' Party and then the Polish United Workers' Party, but categorising her as a 'communist' would miss the point. She remained Left-oriented, and identified herself as such, till her very last days, and sincerely and passionately resented the Polish Right which she perceived as sheerly anti-Semitic.

To simplify a little, the book has at least two key semantic layers. First, it is a polemical book on Irena Sendler and the Jewish children rescued by the underground 'Żegota' Council for Aid to Jews, and their fortunes: the children that cannot remember their parents, unaware when they were born, some of them unaware of their real names. The book features dozens, or perhaps hundreds, of secondary or tertiary characters. Among them are Michał Głowiński, literary scholar and writer, a child survivor of the Holocaust; Jan Dobraczyński, Irena's Social Department associate, otherwise known as a Catholic and nationalist novelist; Adam Celnikier, known since the Second World War as Stefan Zgrzebmski, Irena's second husband; aforementioned Helena Radlińska, Irena's spiritual mentor; Stanisław Papuziński and Zofia Wędrychowska, the parents of the noted author Joanna Papuzińska; and many others. While they appear in the background, they tell us the most important things about the time concerned.

Sticking to the first semantic layer, the book is a sort of dissertation of Polish twentieth-century anti-Semitism, its specificities and reach, its often unobvious history and social effects, in a series of historical episodes. Its best – and definitely, the most suggestive – presentation is offered in the chapter on the outstanding Polish-Jewish writer Bogdan Wojdowski who committed suicide dozens of years after the war, never coming to terms with

the Shoah trauma. The book confronts his poignant, possibly autobiographical, short story about a *szmalcownik* (blackmailer) kid who, counting on a profit, exposes the character's life to danger by denouncing him in broad daylight in the street, against the memoirist accounts. In parallel, the somewhat ambiguous role of Zofia Kossak-Szczucka, Jan Dobraczyński, and many other individuals is recalled.

One of the many questions that may recur in the context of this book is: Why a person whose activities are indisputably worthy of recognition and respect ("our belief in man, in human integrity and commitment abilities, has become synonymous with her name", as the eminent historian Jerzy Jedlicki put it), might have tended to contort, if not merely invent, the course of events she has never taken part in? There is no easy or straightforward answer, and the author has not successfully found all the replies sought. Even though the book under review is a hard-hitting book, it is probably not accusatory. When the central character falsifies the time of her underground activity in order to be granted a higher retirement pension or tries after the war to solicit a certificate of completed MA examination from the University of Warsaw (while she had never actually taken such an exam), instead of stigmatising – or, basically, merely neglecting such minor facts from Irena's life – the author tries to understand and, moreover, show, possibly comprehensively, the determinants behind such decisions. She does at times put a question mark or quote mutually contradicting testimonies, but usually interprets Irena's decisions or behaviours in a friendly and indulgent manner.

As mentioned, during the Nazi occupation Irena Sendler ran the children department of the 'Żegota' Council for Aid to Jews, and is believed to have saved the lives of some 2,500 Jewish children, finding houses and inventing false names for them, making up their life stories, etc. The attempt at verifying her biography is a meticulous study as it confronts disputable facts from her life and reveals the origins of the list of the saved. (To be sure: the final number is based on all the 'Żegota' interventions, including those related to adults in need of forged birth certificates.) If taken literally, the related estimations would mean that Irena Sendler would have led out of the Warsaw ghetto ten children a day, which was physically unfeasible. Bikont challenges such a big number of the saved children, and she does it not to diminish Irena's heroism. Rescuing even one Jewish child under the Nazi occupation conditions called for enormous logistic skills, considerable money, and much luck, as the author explains.

At this point, we come to the second, and no less important, layer. The book is as much on Irena Sendler and her milieu as on a historical policy and the mechanisms of creating heroic figures in Polish history. In one of the possible senses, the book's central character is a phenomenon of the collective imagination. Irena Sendler is at times shown as a professed Catholic and a victim of the secret political police, who was persecuted for her activity with

the Home Army. The authors of such stories, including documentary films, somehow missed the fact that their heroine remained a professed atheist till her last moments, and that she never gave up on her membership in the communist party – neither in 1968, when she hit upon the idea of forming another ‘Żegota’ due to the anti-Semitic campaign, nor even after the martial law was imposed in December 1981 (when at least several hundred thousand party members did it). In this sense, her biography is phantasmagorical, to an extent – but this phantasmagoria is not made of steel, let alone gunmetal. Bikont reminds us also that Irena Sendler always told the same story but each time in a somewhat different way.

Bikont has undoubtedly performed a titanic, painstaking documenting work, successfully showing Irena Sendler not as a character from a patriotic primer but as a multidimensional and complicated personality: despotic, impulsive and dogged, thoughtful and caring, friendly and sympathetic to people. The author shows the features of character that constituted Irena in the toughest of times: her outstanding organising skills, vigour, courage, and strength; all these traits enabled her to extraordinarily contribute to rescuing several hundred Jewish children. Irena’s story is also a story of loneliness and isolation of the rescued and the rescuers; of the actual costs incurred with the involvement in the underground rescue service.

When already acquainted with the study, the reader still faces a quantum of unresolved biographical questions, for instance: To what extent has Irena Sendler ‘the post-war figure’ gained her peculiar biographical identity? As one penetrating reviewer has put it, every monument is placed on a foundation, and it is the latter that Bikont has apparently endeavoured to reconstruct. There is, presumably, an assumption behind such an approach: Irena, whose socialisation began in interwar Poland, during the Great Depression, actually had a multiplied life – a few biographies in one, as it were; Anna Bikont’s biography endeavours to meticulously dismantle all of these ‘lives’ into prime factors.

It is hard to adjudicate which of the study’s dimensions is prevalent. For some time, Sendler and the vicissitudes of ‘her children’ under the occupation seem to prevail. Considerable passages of this extensive and ‘dense’ historical reportage are formed of personal, not infrequently extremely dramatic, adventures of the children and families aided by the Żegota’s Children’s Department. And, one keeps in mind that the ‘discovery’ of Irena Sendler for the broader public and her unheard-of mass media career began, in fact, in the last years of the twentieth century – largely inspired by Jan Tomasz Gross’s revelations about the Jedwabne massacre and a documentary made by high school girls from as far away as Kansas.

This book is deliberately revelatory, as reaching for the truth called for undermining and revisiting the commonly accepted ‘dogmas’ on Irena Sendler. Bikont has apparently been led to many of her findings merely through premises. In some cases, Irena had to be confronted, or juxtaposed, against

herself – in that her accounts about herself, uttered in different years and contexts, tended to be dissimilar. The author tried to understand Irena Sendler, the phenomenon of her environment, and what actually made her such an extraordinary personality. Along these lines, she did not omit the errors made by Irena and her severe failures, including personal. Sendler remained a person full of contradictions till her last breath: she cherished the memory of her (female) underground fellows and recalled their names at diverse occasions, whilst repeatedly and notoriously ascribing their merits to herself. All in all, she tried to keep control of her public image until the end of her life.

What the reader has got is, effectively, not just a biography of Irena Sendler but also an in-depth multi-layer story about Polish-Jewish relations throughout the twentieth century. This is a micro-sociological study on the conditions of life under the occupation, Polish systems of values, methods of coping with adversities such as poverty and dramatic material conditions, and so on. All these contents are bonded by the central character and her circle, including her family, friends, and wards.

The ocean of petty facts, documents, accounts, talks and letters is laid out into a multidimensional fresco made up of several epochs in Polish history. The underlying bibliography encompasses numerous archival accounts, including those stored in local state and diocesan archives, the Institute of National Remembrance Archive, the Jewish Historical Institute Archive, the archive of the Beit Lohamei Hagetaot kibbutz, the Central Zionist Archives, the Yad Vashem Archive, the USC Foundation collection, plus recordings (including interviews with eyewitnesses), websites, and films. The author, herself excellently versed in the most recent historiography of the Holocaust, has consulted her study with several outstanding experts.

The book is undoubtedly one of the most important historical reportages of the recent years and one of the most important books on anti-Semitism, on the difficult Polish-Jewish twines. After *My z Jedwabnego*, it is another fundamental study by Anna Bikont. The reader is confronted not only with the legend of an iconic figure in the history of Poland (Sendler once described herself as ‘the nation’s alibi’) but also with a detailed mechanism of the legend’s generation. With the more intense wave of quasi-memory and quasi-memorialising, clichés and ideological trivialities tend to prevail over research and new interpretations increasingly. The publication of this book in 2017, when the Sejm of the Republic of Poland announced 2018 as the Year of Irena Sendler, had a special purport.

The book was awarded the Ryszard Kapuściński Prize as the best literary reportage, the *Polityka* weekly’s Historical Prize, the Kazimierz Moczarski Historical Prize, and the Poznań Literary Award, all in 2017.

transl. *Tristan Korecki*

Grzegorz Krzywiac

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1649-866X>

Ewa Stańczyk, *Commemorating the Children of World War II in Poland. Combative Remembrance*, Cham, 2019, Palgrave Macmillan, xxi + 175 pp., ill.

We would like to believe that “children and war belong in different domains” (p. 83). This belief guided Brian Porter-Szűcs’s decision from several years ago to illustrate the theses in his book on the history of Poland with a picture of the much-discussed Warsaw statue of the Little Insurgent. In the picture of his choosing, the boy on the statue wears a colourful inflatable wheel, holding a bunch of balloons in his hand. By choosing this photography – a record of the 2011 *Bring the childhood back to the Little Insurgent* action (by young Warsaw urban activists) – Porter-Szűcs tried to normalize Poland and present it “beyond martyrdom”, as suggested by the subtitle of his book. The powerful image of the Little Insurgent also appears on the cover of Ewa Stańczyk’s book. This time unaltered, the image has the usual aura of gravity around it, thus reflecting the weight of the author’s questions about the Polish remembrance of children entangled in the biggest global war to date. A lecturer in the East European Studies at the University of Amsterdam, Stańczyk analyses her ethnographic material from a considerable and productive distance which helps her critically examine the Polish memory of the children caught up in the Second World War.

The book consists of six chapters and an afterword. The opening chapter outlines the key problems to be addressed in the book, with the author looking into the concepts of childhood, emotions and memory. Her point of departure is to challenge the simplified view on children’s lives usually reduced to their deaths in the memorials, with little space left to their previous wartime experience, not to mention the children’s agency (as illustrated by the examples of child breadwinners, food smugglers and, last but not least, carriers invested with family memory, as well as less common instances of underage soldiers, messengers and porters). The victims’ passivity reflected in public memorials represents the defencelessness of children in confrontation with the cruelty of the Second World War perpetrators. On the other hand, it corresponds with the marginal role assigned to children in public space in general.

The figure of the Little Insurgent contradicts this trend. In a bid to explain the phenomenon, Stańczyk refers to the proficiency of Polish memory brokers who learned how to “verbalize their own visions of the past” (p. 19) and resort to emotionally engaging media that can convey the message in a powerful way. A misconstrued icon of child heroism during an adults’ war, the Little Insurgent can also invite public discussion about the variety of children’s wartime experiences that would not reduce those children to passive victims. Initially serving commemoration purposes, then increasingly revived as part of edutainment (which shows some similarity to the narrative of the Warsaw Rising Museum), the venerated figure of the Warsaw Little Insurgent has

created moral tension around a more general phenomenon of child soldiery (positioning Polish history in the context of present-day disheartening post-colonial problems in Africa plagued with child soldiery rather than in the discursive context of the global North).

In each chapter, the author reviews a selected case study in a novel, thought-provoking manner combining very productive ethnographic methods and memory studies. Importantly, Stańczyk offers a fresh perspective on the war not just by applying a new method, but also by touching upon subjects that are relatively unexplored in (particularly non-Polish) historiography. One of such topics takes centre stage in the chapter about the largely forgotten children's camp/prison in Łódź/Litzmannstadt. In the remaining chapters, the author examines the titular commemorative practice, also with reference to children expelled and displaced in the war, children in death camps (Chełmno, Majdanek) and the Kindertransport Memorial in Gdańsk.

Each chapter of Stańczyk's book is, in fact, a vastly interpretative and riveting essay encouraging a separate dialogue and exchange of arguments. I could think of a few more names of authors of memoirs, books, films and child characters that Stańczyk could have referred to here and there. This review, however, deals with the book as a whole. What seems particularly noteworthy is the interesting approach to the issue of voicelessness of child survivors in the past and the participatory practices of memory-making at present. The author examines the issue in an appropriate context of the evolution of remembrance policy, from the times of communist Poland to the memory boom of today. The analysis of these memory-related phenomena is based on research categories applied consistently throughout the book and including pensive sadness, moral panic, morbid pleasure, jingoist rage and commemorative enthusiasm (and fatigue). The author did not fail to address a variety of dimensions of the culture of memory, such as the omission of girl soldiers, 'dark tourism' to death camps, the phenomenon of morbid pleasure attached to it, the impact of materiality (objects) on public memory and finally the connection between the Holocaust memory in Poland and the reception of present-day refugees. The last topic is further elaborated by the author and leads to a painful diagnosis on the elitism of the Shoah memory in Poland; she dubs it an inward-looking, liberal "exercise in self-satisfied congratulation", instrumental in social stratification (p. 137).

Orphaned and hungry, displaced during the war as far as to Siberia, Iran, India or Africa, expelled from their homes in Greater Poland (Wielkopolska), Zamojszczyzna or Volhynia, confined in the ghettos or special prisons for children and annihilated in the death camps – children were spared nothing from the horrors of the Second World War. They were often a target of deliberate violence; some were torn away from their parents for purposes of Aryanization, others were killed to add to the death quota, like those murdered during the so-called *Great Sperre* in Łódź Ghetto. Stańczyk

successfully managed to mention many of these sites of children's suffering without going into too much of shocking detail; she was also careful not to stir emotions that could, particularly in the context of injustice experienced by children, instigate resentment.

That said, I have some slight and very subjective reservations over this aspect of Stańczyk's writing that could as well be perceived as her strength. It concerns how she chooses to present some of her essential arguments. Her reasoning is logical and succinct; at the same time, she delivers her arguments at a fast pace without pausing to ponder some of the human dramas of that time, such as the profoundly tragic phenomenon of the Warsaw ghetto playgrounds. Erected in 1942, they were meant to offer children a brief respite from wartime horrors, a small 'oasis of peace'. As a reader, I needed time to contemplate those human tragedies with the feeling that they could have been granted more space in a book, particularly given the chosen literary format allowing for such musings to more extent than a research paper. The pleasant memories which seem to dominate over the traumatising ones in some of the accounts of children's experience of Soviet deportation seem to me rather an exception than a rule. Clearly, pleasant incidents stand out amidst daily monotonous grind and hardships of the Siberian existence.

Stańczyk's writing style may be a bit hurried, but the narrative unfolds at an exciting pace, while her command of English is hugely impressive. All of these make Stańczyk's book a truly engrossing read despite the multitude of presented arguments which, as it happens, constitute the book's exceptional strength. Here is a publication which provides an essential point of reference for the increasingly popular studies of wartime experience and children's memory. The last living witnesses of the Second World War experienced this global conflict as children. Studies of their memory have become particularly important as a way to keep a fragile balance in a country where, if I may add from my end, the number of military classes is rapidly growing (50 thousand pupils a year receive such schooling), with replica rifle-wielding re-enactors allowed in nurseries.

Lidia Zessin-Jurek

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7701-7340>

ERC Grant 'Unlikely Refuge?', Czech Academy of Sciences