

REVIEWS

Acta Poloniae Historica
124, 2021
PL ISSN 0001-6829

Saskia Metan, *Wissen über das östliche Europa im Transfer. Edition, Übersetzung und Rezeption des “Tractatus de duabus Sarmatiis” (1517)*, Wien-Köln-Weimar, 2019, Böhlau, 316 pp., 2 tables, 1 ill., index; series: Bausteine zur Slavischen Philologie und Kulturgeschichte. Neue Folge, Reihe A: Slavistische Forschungen, 91

Tractatus de duabus Sarmatiis [A Treatise on the Two Sarmatias] by Maciej of Miechów [Maciej Miechowita; Mat(t)hias de Miechow] enjoys unfading interest among scholars, as is evidenced by the study in question (being a modified version of the doctoral dissertation submitted by the author at the Technische Universität of Dresden in 2017). The author's decision to show the transfer of knowledge on Eastern Europe based on the examples of the editions, translations and reception of the *Tractatus* by Miechowita has to be regarded as apt. In this case, we come across a multilateral transfer: the ancient and medieval knowledge on Sarmatia in Cracow was critically elaborated by Miechowita and subsequently forwarded via the foreign, mutually influential editions. Influenced by the letters exchanged with the Swedish scholar Johannes Magnus, Miechowita complemented the information on the Goths in the second Cracow edition (1521).

In the introductory section, Saskia Metan declares her choice of the methodologies related to the cultural transfer theory, remarking that through the editions of the work in question, not only the text but also the cultural practice was transferred; the latter is confined by her, though, to a description of the alien territories, thereby focusing on a selected element of the cultural transfer – namely, transfer of knowledge. Such a concept enables the author to cross the limits of the existing current of research on the treatise. While the sources of the *Tractatus* have already been well recognised, the work's later reception has not been systematically elaborated on. Scholars have generally tended to mention the multiplicity of its editions and translations, the statistics never being reconciled. The dependencies between the editions have never before been discussed in an ordered manner, and no in-depth analysis of their contexts has been proposed – although the treatise's inclusion in travel or historical anthologies has been occasionally mentioned. The research on the European reception of the *Tractatus* has hitherto been limited mainly to approaches expressed within the context of bilateral Polish-German, Polish-Italian, or Polish-Dutch/Netherlandish relations.

Following the adopted methodological assumptions, Metan particularly focuses on the intermediaries in the transfer process – the editors and publishers of Miechowita’s work, the printers, translators, and readers. The role of personal connections and personal interests contributing to the editions is highlighted. In her discussion of the German translation, the author points to the contacts of the merchant Jakob Fugger with the Thurzo family, with whom Miechowita was friends (as attested by, *inter alia*, the work’s dedication to Stanislas Thurzo, Bishop of Olmütz [Olomouc]). As a participant of the peace negotiations between Poland and Muscovy, Fugger apparently appreciated the practical importance of the information contained in the *Tractatus*, and commissioned its translation by Johannes Eck. Even the Cracow editions are regarded by Metan as instances of transfer, as they were produced by printers of German origin. The author skillfully combines cultural history research with philological analyses. Basing on linguistic pragmatics theories, she offers her own proposition of translation studies contextualised by transfer of knowledge. The actions of the translator, such as abridgements, additions, or semantic modifications, are considered by her not in relation to the input text but through correspondence/appropriateness with the new function to be fulfilled by the translated text. As Metan demonstrates, the transfer of knowledge has taken place not only in the cultural and geographical aspects, related to the treatise having been published in a number of European cities, but there is also a social aspect to it, as certain translations tended to adapt the work’s content to the level of the less-learned reader.

The author refers in the introduction also to the mind mapping method, defining space as a cultural construct and object of collective perception. She points to the two space construction processes: (i) measurement of space and placement of objects within it; and, (ii) ideas or concepts, memorising the objects and ascribing meanings to them. In the study, she makes use of the latter process.

Metan has drawn some inspiration from the research of Katharina N. Piechocki, who points to the fluidity and uncertain status of Europe’s borders in the modern era – in particular, from the concept of the *translatio* of the ancient notion of ‘Sarmatia’ in Maciej of Miechów.¹ The consideration of geographical descriptions as an example of *translatio* of ancient knowledge enables the author to abandon the negative evaluations of the work in question as once formulated by geographic historians.

¹ Katharina N. Piechocki, ‘Discovering Eastern Europe: Cartography and Translation in Maciej Miechowita’s *Tractatus de Duabus Sarmatiis* (1517)’, in Danilo Facca and Valentina Lepri (eds), *Polish Culture in the Renaissance. Studies in the Arts, Humanism and Political Thought* (Firenze, 2013), 53–69. The monograph by Katharina N. Piechocki, *Cartographic Humanism: The Making of Early Modern Europe* (Chicago–London, 2019), was published in parallel with the Saskia Metan book under discussion.

The chronological framework is set by the years 1517 to 1606, being respectively the date of the first (Cracovian) edition up to the last (Venetian) edition of the work. The study's structure, which is basically traditional, is correct and transparent. Chapter One discusses the state of research, the methodology, and the research questionnaire, the sources and the rules of transcription. The input context of the knowledge transfer is delineated in Chapter Two, which shows the interest in space in the modern era, knowledge on Eastern Europe before 1517, and the position of Poland on the humanistic map of Europe. Chapter Three, following the classical editorial introduction pattern, deals with the first edition of the treatise by Maciej of Miechów, published in Cracow. A brief biography of Miechowita and his output is followed by a discussion of the circumstances of the writing of the *Tractatus* and of its first printed edition, the work's construction and the sources used by its author, the techniques he applied, the style and language, and how his contemporaries responded to the first edition.

Chapter Four, dealing with the editions and translations of Miechowita's treatise, forms the core of the study. A review of the work's editions is followed by subchapters discussing the consecutive main groups of these editions, categorised according to the filiations established by the author. The editions are discussed according to a common pattern, presenting the editor and/or publisher – and, possibly, the translator – as the intermediaries; the circumstances of the edition and the related editions. For the translations, analysed are commentaries of the translators (in the introductory sections), and the translations themselves.

Discussing the reception of the *Tractatus*, Chapter Five partly resumes the issues addressed in the preceding sections – such as the increased number of descriptions of Eastern Europe since the 1520s, the contextualisation of the treatise through making it part of anthologies, these aspects being enriched by examples of reception of the work's geographical, ethnographical, and historiographic contents. Chapter Six summarises the entire argument; a bibliography, index of personal and geographical names, and a list of tables round off the book.

The most valuable part of the study is the proposed analysis of the *Tractatus* editions, demonstrating that even the Latin editions were not mere reprints; therefore, separate consideration of each edition is relevant. A meticulous analysis allows us to explain the reasons for so many editions in national languages and to evaluate their importance. Useful in following the author's argument is a tabular breakdown of the editions (p. 86) and a visual representation of their filiations (p. 240). Metan ascribes particular importance to the translations into national languages (Polish, German, Italian, and Dutch), stressing the fact that they accounted for more than half of the *Tractatus* editions. She identifies the reasons for the spread of reading habits (a new group of readers emerging among merchant circles) and the appreciation of national languages among the humanists.

The author seeks to explain the specific translation solutions, taking into account the target reader of the translated text. In his translation, designed for German merchants, Johannes Eck quit the citations from ancient authors and language mastery; instead, he consistently used the name of the Don, whereas Miechowita alternately used the river's ancient name of Tanais. Along with names in the German version, Eck oftentimes kept their Latin equivalents. Metan points, moreover, to the assumption of the narrator's role by the translator: Maciej's word *nostrī* [our people] was rendered by Eck as [the] Poles [*Polecken*]. Upon publishing the same work in its Latin version in 1518, in Augsburg, on the occasion of the convocation of the Reich's Diet [Reichstag], Eck targeted it at the learned reader and, accordingly, modified or altered certain names and used the spelling compliant with the rules of Classical Latin. In his Polish translation, Andrzej Glaber made certain simplifications, omitted some repetitions or synonyms, explained difficult terms, replaced Latin names proper with their Polish equivalents, adding at times the corresponding Ruthenian or German names. He preserved the Polish perspective, translating the word *nostrī* as *nasi* [our people]. In his Italian translation, Annibale Maggi sought to explain the Eastern European realities to the Italian reader, adding comments and glosses which were preserved in the printed edition; he moreover added the words 'river' or 'mount(ain)' to the Eastern European geographic names.

Metan considers giving the work a new meaning by altering its title in terms of cultural transfer – the examples being: *Polskie wypisanie dwojej krainy świata* [A Polish Description of Two Lands of the World], in the Polish translation – apparently pointing to Sarmatia's no longer being in the spotlight; or, the Italian *Historia delle due Sarmatiae* – a focus on the historical, rather than geographical, aspect.

Metan examines the reception of Maciej's work with the use of quantitative and qualitative methods. The first measure is the number of the treatise's editions, including their chronology and mutual dependencies. In evaluating the importance of the individual editions, the author differentiates between the monographic ones and those being part of anthologies. Among the ten Latin editions of the treatise, most were published as part of travel and historical anthologies, such as Johannes Böhm's *Omnium gentium mores, leges et ritus* (Venice, 1542), *Poloniae Historiae Corpus* by Johannes Pistorius (Basel, 1582), or *Rerum Moscovitarum* by Siegmund von Herberstein (Frankfurt, 1600). The *Tractatus* became in them an indispensable source of knowledge on Eastern Europe. In parallel, Metan points to the fact that Poland never saw such a contextualisation (without explaining the reasons, though).

Investigating into the European reception of Miechowita's work, the author points to the chronology and places of publication. Five editions were issued in Cracow, but the 'series' came to an early end (1517–42). The treatise appeared in print the longest in Venice (1542–1606) and in Basel (1532–82). Among

the publications of its translations, Italian editions accounted for more than half. The comparison of the number of editions of the *Tractatus* against the other geographical-historical works on Sarmatia – such as those of Maciej Strykowski or Marcin Bielski – has enabled Metan to grasp the extraordinary success of Maciej's work, which she juxtaposes with the success of Marcin Kromer's chronicles *De origine et rebus gestis Polonorum* and *Polonia* (giving no exact statistics regarding the editions of the later works, the author refers us to the study by Hans-Jürgen Bömelburg).²

Another hard-to-grasp measure is the circulation of individual editions and territorial distribution of their readers. To determine the owners of individual prints is often an impossible exercise. Hence, the author has decided to assess the scale of the treatise's dissemination based on the copies presently preserved in German, Polish, Italian, and Dutch libraries, as broken down in Table 1 (p. 89); she explains this approach by pointing to the time-consuming aspect of potential queries also covering the other countries. Such a criterion can trigger reservations, for the author has specified no guiding criteria behind it (one may guess that she has selected the countries where Miechowita's work was translated into national languages). Moreover, this classification does not refer to the sixteenth-/seventeenth-century situation; a better solution would have been to specify the institutions where those copies are kept today (which often does not mean that they were in those very places in the sixteenth/seventeenth cc. and were actually read there). The fact that Metan never specifies the copies she has found raises reservations; the numbers quoted in the table do not correspond with the copies enumerated in the bibliography's list of sources included at the end of the book. In compiling her breakdown, the author used Web catalogues, respectively, for the libraries in Germany – Karlsruhe Virtueller Katalog; the Netherlands – World Cat; Italy – Servizio Bibliotecario Nazionale; Poland – Katalog Rozproszony Bibliotek Polskich [KaRo]. In the latter case, the use of the KaRo is a basic error since this particular catalogue does not cover some of the libraries of importance, to mention the Czartoryski Library in Cracow, or the one of Kórnik. Instead, the National Library's central catalogue of old prints should have been used. An initial verification of the statistics given by the author enables one to undermine the legitimacy of such a breakdown. For the 1517 Cracow edition, the table refers to six copies in Polish libraries, the final bibliography mentioning four of them.³ Yet, for this particular edition, in a tentative search through

² Hans-Jürgen Bömelburg, *Frühneuzeitliche Nationen im östlichen Europa: das polnische Geschichtsdenken und die Reichweite einer humanistischen Nationalgeschichte (1500–1700)* (Wiesbaden, 2006), 110–13.

³ Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, BJ, St. Dr.Cim. 4322; Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka we Wrocławiu, BUWr, A-E6, F4; Biblioteka Zakładu Narodowego Ossolińskich, Wrocław, Oss. XVI.Qu.1920, & Oss.XVI.Qu.1924.

the catalogues available in an electronic form, as many as twelve copies kept at Polish libraries can be found.⁴ Errors of a similar order are the case also for the other editions in Polish libraries, which undermines the credibility of the conclusions drawn by the author based on the statistics specified in the aforementioned table.

Metan researches, moreover, into the responses to Miechowita's work from his contemporaries, including Emperor Maximilian I, Swedish theologian Johannes Magnus, and the humanists Ulrich von Hutten and Willibald Pirckheimer, who expressed their view in the letters exchanged between each other. She also evokes examples of works that referred to the *Tractatus*, mainly from the German-speaking areas – such as Johannes Eck's commentary to Aristotle's *De coelo*, Sebastian Münster's *Cosmographia*, Herberstein's *Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii*, Böhm's *Omnium gentium mores, leges et ritus*, and Conrad Gesner's *Historia animalium*. The decreasing interest in the *Tractatus* in Europe had to do with the popularity of Herberstein's work. The reception of Miechowita's treatise in Poland is discussed in a concise manner, which can be regarded as the right decision, given the rich literature on the topic. It would have been interesting, though, to see a more expanded discussion on the reception in other European countries, once it has been mentioned that sir Thomas Brown was familiar with the work.

The author tries to examine its reception also through the readers' responses to the text. To this end, she investigates the side notes and underlined items in a total of twenty copies of the work's editions (both Latin and translated). Such research is tedious but its outcome may prove rather expectable. And indeed, the author observes that geographical names and names of rare animals were the most frequent notes; among the peoples described, most of the glosses and underlines appeared with the descriptions of Tatars. Another remark is that historical events formed a large part of Sarmatia's mental map. If applied, a comparative perspective could have helped find to what extent such notes were typical of such works.

A small remark regarding the editorial aspect: the personal and geographical names are listed in the index in an inconsistent manner. Proper names are basically given in their German versions (e.g. 'Stobnica, Jan von'), along with items such as 'Miechowa, Maciej z', or the Latin version (in the genitive case):

⁴ Due to pandemic restrictions, checking up with the National Library's central catalogue was impossible. Apart from the four copies mentioned by Metan in the bibliography, the following copies of the edition are presently identifiable in Poland: Biblioteka Xiążąt Czartoryskich, Kraków, BCzart., 357 I Cim; Biblioteka Kórnicka PAN, BKórni, Cim.Qu.2071; Płock: Biblioteka im. Zielińskich TNP, XVI, 90; Toruń: Biblioteka Główna UMK, BG, St. Druki, Pol.6.II.546; Warsaw, Biblioteka Narodowa, BN SD XVI.Qu.1562, BN SD XVI.Qu.701; Biblioteka Uniwersytecka w Warszawie, BUW, St. Druki, Sd.614.685; Papieski Wydział Teologiczny we Wrocławiu, XXIV.1.Q.9.

'Aubrius, Ioannis'. The version 'Ramusio, Giovanni B.' is also erroneous since one double name is the case ('Ramusio, Giovanni Battista'). The apostrophe (') in the word 'Rus' is in the cross-reference to the legendary brother of Czech and Lech. It would be helpful to apply cross-references for Latin consistently and German names of localities appearing twice in the index – as in, e.g., the Don: once with 'Don' and for the second time, with 'Tanais'. 'Guagnini, Alessandro' appears twice in the index, both items referring to the same person. For Władysław Jagiełło, the explanation 'König' is added, which is not the case with Sigismund I or Sigismund II Augustus.

Despite these critical remarks and observations, the study has to be rated high, as it enriches and systematises our knowledge on the reception of Maciej of Miechów's *Tractatus* in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe. The elucidation of the context of the work's individual editions and subjecting them to a philological analysis has enabled us to determine their mutual (inter)dependencies, thereby showing a multidimensional process of knowledge transfer in modern-era Europe. It can be regretted that the author did not attempt to more strongly highlight the conclusions regarding the transfer of knowledge about Eastern Europe and the role of the treatise's consecutive editions and translations in this process. The ambivalent assessment of the reception of Miechowita's work formulated in the final sentence of the conclusion calls for a more specific discussion. The study under review allows one to make a pessimistic observation that transfer of knowledge led at times to the distortion and deformation of the latter – as exemplified by the 'rivers of Ruthenia flowing out of Koblenz' in Michael Herr's German translation of *Tractatus*.

transl. Tristan Korecki

Anna Horeczy

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1000-4158>

Catherine Brice (ed.), *Exile and the Circulation of Political Practices*, Newcastle upon Tyne, 2020, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, UK, 225 pp.

Migration is a form of modern being in the world; hence, individuals and groups crossing geographical, language, and cultural frontiers have become an integral part of the landscape of modernity. Moreover, the movements of those groups of people communicating between themselves in their new locations were, in several cases, an important link in the processes of mediation and transfer of modern concepts, ideas, and practices to their respective countries of origin. For this very reason, political emigration was not only a form of opposition and protest against the authorities or, in broader terms, against the situation in the exile's homeland. Its long-term effect, in so many

cases, was a change in the political landscape that affected mainly those who had previously induced or outright forced individuals and/or groups to leave.

An attempt at revisiting these issues has been made by the twelve authors of a relatively small book entitled *Exile and the Circulation of Political Practices*, edited by Catherine Brice of the University Paris-Est Créteil. The studies are arranged into four thematic parts whose respective titles are ‘Global Repertoires of Collective Action in Exile’, ‘Speaking Out and Conspiring’, ‘Organisations’, and ‘Political Cultures in Exile’.

A definite advantage of the book is that the contributions cover quite a geographically broad spectrum of the issues addressed. The authors look at the migrants primarily from Hungary, Cuba, France, Spain, and Italy (the latter apparently being the most broadly represented). To reverse the perspective, the countries under analysis where the political exiles from the aforementioned countries sought refuge, include Greece, France, the United Kingdom, Chile, Ottoman Empire, and more. With this broad geographical picture, the almost complete absence of discussion of political emigration from East Central Europe – especially from the German, Polish, and Russian lands (Polish migrants have a significant role only in the essay by Utrecht University’s Camille Creyghton) – is striking. Among the ‘transnational spaces’ where those leaving their native country arrived, Switzerland, the nineteenth-century asylum for revolutionaries from a number of European countries, is definitely absent. No less important for the completeness of the picture, authors deal with migrations of diverse ideological shades, focusing on the activities of revolutionaries as well as monarchists in exile. Such perspective is really valuable as it opens comparative potential and incites follow-up questions and research problems.

As Catherine Brice declares in the introduction, social history of ideas is the methodologically primary point-of-reference for the contributed studies (pp. 8 – 10): the current that has grown on the French soil (more broadly known as *histoire sociale des idées politiques*) and gradually gaining popularity in the French-speaking academia.⁵ Paradoxically, however, the declaration corresponds with the clear indication that the anthology does not seek to

⁵ The recent decade has indeed saw a number of publications referring to this particular trend, though no related ‘manifesto’ or even a summary exposition of its characteristic methods and tools has yet been published. Of the interesting publications related to the ‘social history of ideas’, see Frédérique Matonti, ‘Plaidoyer pour une histoire sociale des idées politiques’, *Revue d’histoire moderne & contemporaine*, lix, 4-bis (2012), 85–104; Chloé Gaboriaux and Arnault Skornicki (eds), *Vers une histoire sociale des idées politiques* (Villeneuve-d’Ascq, 2017); Thibaut Rioufret, ‘La mise en politique des idées. Pour une histoire sociale des idées en milieu partisan’, *Politix*, cxxvi, 2 (2019), 7–35; Julien Weisbein, and Samuel Hayat, *Introduction à la socio-histoire des idées politiques* (Bruxelles, 2020).

research into flows and borrowings of socio-political ideas and concepts, for “[l]ideas never circulate in free-floating isolation, but due to the context in which they are deployed and the factors driving their circulation” (p. 9). It is quite evident that, rather than functioning as separate entities in social life, ideas/concepts appear each time in the form of specific mediations (including off-texts ones). However, separating the studies on the circulation of ideas and practices seems somewhat artificial to me: also with their tools, offered by the current of the French ‘social history of ideas’, appear to be basically complementary, so associating them can bring cognitive benefits. What is more, Brice’s methodological declaration is expressed somewhat hyperbolically since the authors of the studies do not refer again to this methodological current; some of them point to inspiration from other schools, such as the popular Cambridge School. In my view, their research practice does not always bear traces of inspiration drawn from the social history of ideas.

The most interesting aspect of this book is the questions posed by the authors. Although their proposed answers are not always satisfactory, identifying and appreciating the importance of specific problems in the humanities justifies the legitimacy of publishing each of the studies concerned. According to the presented research, an important aspect in the activities of the political exiles were their public speeches (which can obviously be judged based on written texts surviving to this day) and, possibly, press coverage of the given event. As Camille Creighton stresses, speeches were usually delivered at a banquet, while raising a toast, or during a *mityng*: the latter word, being a Polish form of the English *meeting*, was borrowed into the nineteenth-century Polish in this particular form to describe the political practice that was adopted, as a novelty, by Polish migrants after 1831, who had borrowed it from the French political circles (pp. 58–9).

Research on the migrants’ speeches implies, however, some important problems related, among other things, to political representation. On behalf of whom do the migrants speak, after all: do they speak for themselves, or for their political group? Or for the exiles’ community, on the whole? The entire nation, country of origin? These questions imply the need to resolve what is the given emigration community’s source of the legitimisation to act (pp. 51–2). Certainly, an answer to such a question would have turned each time into a form of political declaration; hence the resolution of this fundamental question triggered tensions and dissensions inside the emigration community. As aptly pointed by Romy Sánchez (University of Lille and CNRS), this was the reason why speeches in exile were offensive. Sánchez uses the pendulum metaphor: such addresses might have merely been full of invectives cast at the competitive groups that were formed with the view of emigrating, whereas they were also criticism-lined calls for action or reflection (p. 65). Another field in which the exiles look for legitimisation to act was, often, the reflection on history. The situation of the emigration calls for a new story of the past;

hence, those expelled from their native country rewrite history anew – as opposed to those who have expelled them (pp. 69–70).

What remains of the tempestuous nineteenth-century migration history, though, does not boil to the surviving letters, diaries, printed orations or journals, kept today in some spacious libraries and archives. It happens that traces of migration and transfer are tangible, affecting the lives of many – as demonstrated by Heléna Tóth (Bamberg University), whose interesting essay inspects the politics of architecture and the activities of Gyula Andrásy in the context of the redevelopment of Budapest after 1867 (pp. 186 – 205). Having moved to Paris and London after the fall of the Spring of Nations, Andrásy carefully observed the French capital city, drawing inspiration from its great extension and redevelopment project implemented in 1852 – 70 under the supervision of Prefect Georges-Eugène Haussmann. Importantly, he could witness the corresponding process in the Hungarian capital city after his return home and amnesty. Hence, Tóth observes, the transfer should never be perceived as an isolated point in time but rather as a process distributed in time, for when luckily back from exile, migrants tend to attentively watch the events taking place in their former asylum country. Taking Andrásy's activity as an example, it becomes clear that no transfer occurs without resistance and friction. While for Andrásy and his followers, Paris was a model of modern urban planning oriented toward turning the capital city into an important symbol of the greatness of the French nation, his opponents tended to perceive the architecture of Paris in terms of reflection of the authoritarian regime.

A crucial aspect that should potentially appeal to the reader interested in Polish history is the encouragement to think over the apparent 'uniqueness', or even 'specificity' of the emigration caused by the failed November Insurrection of 1830–1 – the occurrence being commonly referred to as the 'Great Emigration', a term being far from neutral.⁶ The multiple publications dealing with diverse aspects of the lives and activities of those who left the Congress Poland after the 1831 defeat typically approach their activities as émigrés, particularly in the domain of culture, as an unprecedented phenomenon in history of Europe. Yet, as it follows from the case studies analysed in the volume, several problems related to living far away from one's native country as well as numerous political practices pursued by Polish migrants corresponded with that characteristic of the migration movements in other regions of Europe and beyond.

The research focused on transfers of political practices essentially opens the space for the relativisation of the 'uniqueness' of Polish post-1831 emigration: due to the adopted perspective, the object is, basically, mutual flows

⁶ Idesbald Goddeeris has earlier pointed to this issue in his important book *La grande émigration polonaise en Belgique, 1831–1870: élites et masses en exil à l'époque romantique* (Frankfurt, 2013).

and borrowings. This perspective makes individual and apparently dispersed phenomena networked, the researcher's attention is focused on the functioning, stabilisation, and transfer within the network. In this particular case, the network is the nineteenth-century transnational community of political emigrants sharing the experiences and co-creating new practices in exile – and, in a broader perspective, informing the situation in their home countries.

The final remark that comes to my mind as a reader of *Exile and the Circulation of Political Practices* goes beyond the standard task of a reviewer (which is, basically, focusing on the content of the publication under review). I cannot namely ignore the temptation to remark the publisher's care and accuracy, particularly as regards the artwork. It is hard to get rid of the impression that the Cambridge Scholars Publishing has done a rather disappointing job in this respect. This is true especially for the cover design, which in no way corresponds with the content, being a randomly selected graphic motif against which the title and editor's name are featured. Moreover, the book has no biographical notes of the contributors, which is otherwise customary for such collections. There is no index of names, either, which does not facilitate the use of this book at all. Apparently, even the recognised publishers of international renown tend at times to forget that the aesthetic aspect of publication and editorial diligence ought to harmonise with the content-related quality of a book.

transl. Tristan Korecki

Piotr Kuligowski

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

Vedran Duančić, *Geography and Nationalist Visions of Interwar Yugoslavia*, Cham, 2020, Palgrave Macmillan, 285 pp., ills, indexes; series: Modernity, Memory and Identity in South-East Europe

Political involvements of geographers have long been the object of interest for historians of Germany, who wrote on Reich's imperialism, the *Lebensraum* concept, or the whimsies of Nazi geopoliticians.⁷ East Central Europe was in these studies merely an object of German expansion – scientific, military, and economic. For the last dozen-or-so years, scholars from this region have successfully been making up for their negligence, reinstating in the history of geography a galaxy of outstanding geographers and scholars of the related

⁷ Guntram H. Herb, *Under the Map of Germany: Nationalism and Propaganda, 1918–1945* (London, 1997); *¿Geographie?, i: Antworten vom 18. Jahrhundert bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*, ed. by Hans-Dietrich Schultz (Berlin, 2003) [= Arbeitshefte des GIHU, 88]; *¿Geographie?, ed. by Hans-Dietrich Schultz (Berlin, 2004) [= Arbeitshefte des GIHU, 100].*

fields, who can definitely be included among the nation builders and ranked equal with the better-known German ‘political professors’. Publications dealing with these individuals every so often focus on the most outstanding scholars who enjoy the highest professional respect and were involved in politics. The figures of Eugeniusz Romer, Pál Teleki, Stepan Rudnyc’kyj, or Jovan Cvijić play the main roles in this research.⁸ Special attention devoted to them is supported not only by their unquestionable achievements and intellectual quality but also their internationalisation. This, enabled by the numerous translations, has made publications of illustrious geographers available even to those historians who have no command of their mother tongues. Moreover, the focus on a few or a dozen best-known figures excellently facilitates juxtapositions and comparisons of all sorts.

The book by Vedran Duančić, a Croatian graduate of the Florentine European University Institute, makes a step forward. It deals with geographical concepts of Yugoslavia, formulated by the interwar Croatian, Slovenian, and Serbian geographers, particularly Filip Lukas, the long-standing president of Matica hrvatska, a strongly right-wing cultural and educational organisation. Albeit the author is excellently versed in the fast-accurring historiography and is capable of taking advantage of this knowledge, he deliberately omits (though not completely) the great names, focusing instead on second-rank figures among the scholars in interwar Yugoslavia. This marks an essential correction to the previous research, one that is based on a quite reasonable observation. Duančić namely states that the international successes of Cvijić (who could probably be ranked on equal terms with Romer or Teleki, with quite similar roles in their respective countries) made him distanced from his country. While his most important works were published in French or English (their Serbo-Croatian translations were to be made and issued later on), the first synthetic studies and textbooks describing their new homeland were penned by other, less-known geographers. Indeed, it was Cvijić’s merit, as an expert of the Serbian delegation to the Peace Conference in Paris, who contributed to the outlining of the country’s borderline; this, however, was apparently the reason preventing him from becoming the first to describe

⁸ *Osteuropa kartiert – Mapping Eastern Europe*, ed. by Jörn Happel and Christophe von Werdt (Münster, 2010); *Kampf der Karten: Propaganda und Geschichtskarten als Politische Instrumente und Identitätstexte*, ed. by Peter Haslinger and Vadim Oswalt (Marburg, 2012); Alexandra Schweiger, *Polens Zukunft liegt im Osten: Polnische Ostkonzepte der späten Teilungszeit (1890–1918)* (Marburg, 2014); Balázs Ablonczy, *Pál Teleki (1874–1941): The Life of a Controversial Hungarian Politician*, trans. Thomas J. and Helen D. DeKornfeld (Boulder, CO, 2006); Gernot Briesewitz, *Raum und Nation in der polnischen Westforschung 1918–1948* (Osnabrück, 2014); Steven Seegel, *Map Men: Transnational Lives and Deaths of Geographers in the Making of East Central Europe* (Chicago, 2018).

the new homeland. Even if several of his Serbian, Croatian, and Slovenian colleagues considered themselves to have learned from Cvijić or endeavoured to imitate him, it remains the fact that their books, rather than his, responded to the citizens' new need to know more about their country.

The central characters of the Duančić book are, therefore, those geographers who were the first to offer an answer to the question of what Yugoslavia actually was, what its natural frontiers were, what forces could give hope for maintaining its territorial unity, and what were the threats to that unity. With time, some of them – like Filip Lukas, who is dealt with the most extensively – started to alter their attitudes, concluding that Yugoslavia was an artificial formation that opposed the principles of geopolitics. Regardless of their political purport, all the opinions analysed in this book fit into the confines of scientific discourse.

The study is composed of an introduction (marked as Chapter One), summarising the present state of research and outlining the issues addressed, which is followed by six other chapters and a conclusion. A bibliography and an intensive index are attached, along with a few maps. Apart from three, these maps are not reproductions of cartographic works based on the publications under analysis but modern maps of Yugoslavia, inserted to facilitate the recognition of its geographical and administrative divisions.

Chapter Two introduces the reader to the institutional landscape of Yugoslav geography. Emphasised are the shared elements as well as the differences between the main centres of science, i.e. Belgrade, Zagreb, Skopje, and Ljubljana. The common thing about the Yugoslav geographers was their academic socialisation. Many of them had been through the studies at Austrian universities, in Vienna or Graz. The dominant 'father' figure of Cvijić, commonly praised 'patriarch of Yugoslav geography' (and, obviously, a graduate of the Vienna University), was hanging over all of them. It was not independent of that patronage that Yugoslav geographers placed considerable emphasis on field research.

On the other hand, the splits within their milieu were rather complex. The noticeable ethnic differences overlapped with tensions between scholars oriented toward physical and political geography and those who found ethnographic concepts more familiar. The traditions of the universities had a say as well. In Zagreb, the main focus, already before the First World War, was on universal geography, while the other academic centres tended to focus on describing their respective home grounds. Duančić demonstrates how the racial theories gradually became fully-fledged everywhere whilst geopolitics became regarded as the most modern accessible language of discourse on space.

Chapter Three describes Cvijić's geographical views, focusing on the elements that have prevalently impacted the mainstream of Yugoslav geography. The authority of the great scientist was among the incentives for a strong legitimisation of characterological threads, coupled with anthropogeography.

In this context, it is not without a pinch of irony that Duančić rhetorically asks whether, during the Great War, the French attendees of Cvijić's lectures at the Sorbonne could realise that it was Friedrich Ratzel himself – an exponent of the German anthropogeographic school, which was dragged through mire at the time – speaking through the mouth of the Serbian scholar.

Chapter Four analyses the most important scientific statements that defined the newly-emerged state in spatial terms. Duančić penetratingly shows how diverse were the argumentative strategies used by the scholars at the time. Again, the ethnic specificities came to the fore. The apparently astonishingly low number of publications by Serbian authors, as compared to the synthetic geographical studies penned by their Croatian and Slovenian peers, reflected the increasingly dominant role of Belgrade in the country in those interbellum years. The opinions from other parts of Yugoslavia appeared all the more interesting then. Anton Melik, a Slovene, skilfully merged Slovenian particularism with the idea of unity, demonstrating his small home country was Yugoslavia in miniature, a one-nation country. Both Melik and his Croatian colleague Lukas clearly pointed to a positive role of a common state in the context of the impending border conflict with Italy and Austria. Yet, the conviction that Yugoslavia was a formation of nature, one that served the interest of the entire country and its dwellers, as well as the individual 'tribes', became fading with time, and Lukas was the most expressive example of this trend. Duančić indicates in what ways those same geographical arguments used by the Croatian geographer in his justification of the state's unity in the former half of the 1920s, turned in the later period into a rhetorical tool used to tear Croatia off from Serbia, which to Lucas's mind proved alien to it in civilisational and spiritual terms.

The subsequent chapter describes the local, Croatian and Slovenian varieties of geopolitics, which gained strength in the thirties. The author identifies the borrowings (some of them being, perhaps, just analogies) drawn from the German classics of the discipline, delving into its favourite intellectual forms of entertainment such as creating spatial metaphors or manipulating the statistical data. Again, Filip Lukas appears to be a key figure. On the one hand, this Catholic priest, political activist and scholar relatively most completely fulfilled the geopolitical ideal of a scholar that is on close terms with social life and can influence the actual political situation. On the other hand, his publications provided extremely interesting examples for local geopolitical theories (some of which will be mentioned below). Interestingly, though not surprisingly, the Yugoslav authors' criticism of the German geopolitical school (represented in the study by Svetozar Ilešić and Anton Melik) also used symbolical instrumentation of this discipline.

Chapter Six analyses in detail the views of Lukas as the leading exponent of Yugoslav geopolitics, thereby justifying the prominent place he holds across the previous sections. Duančić traces the geographer's transition from

providing geopolitical grounds for the existence of Yugoslavia to a geopolitical denial of its *raison d'être*. This conclusive point will be of no astonishment to the reader more or less familiar with the ideological current. Similarly to the ranks of nationalist scholars of his sort, this geographer concluded that it was his homeland that formed the genuine *antemurale Christianitatis*, his compatriots representing the purest and the most valuable racial type; open to valuable external influence, they have remained loyal, in the most excellent manner, to their unique national character. In Lukas's own words, "of all the Slavic peoples in the south, the Croats showed the strongest resistant power in accepting others' [influence], because while accepting it they remained indigenous creators and builders of their own spiritual, cultural kind" (p. 211).

In the concise concluding section, instead of recapitulating the content, the author focuses on a few most interesting observations. The geographical determinism, being fundamental to the picture of the Balkans in the studies by Jovan Cvijić, appears in the light of the publications analysed in the book as a common approach that is mostly independent of the influence of the most outstanding Yugoslav geographer. As is apparent from the case of Lukas (among other examples), the said determinism could moreover have had very different purports. The same instruments proved of use in defence of territorial integrity and spiritual unity of Yugoslavia as well as in the service of Croatian irredentism. However, the ethnic conflict was not the only field of dispute wielded with the use of geographical arguments. Here and there, the author refers to tensions between geographers and ethnographers; political sympathies toward the peasant movement tended to appear among the latter. In the Croatian political discourse, this phenomenon led to an intense competition, expressed in scholarly language, between the nationalists pursuing geopolitics and peasant activists fascinated with the country's ethnography.

In the final sections of this book, Duančić touches upon issues that would have come to the minds of most of the readers from the beginning of the reading. The Second World War over, geography suddenly lost its political significance or meaning. The socialist and federal Yugoslavia was no more a nutrient medium for further spinning of geopolitical theories; in any case, their most fertile authors, Lukas among them, emigrated after the collapse of the Croatian satellite state of the Third Reich. The war in Yugoslavia in the early 1990s revived the old demons, evoking back the interwar maps and theories. Duančić aptly sees them not as a manifestation of strength of any of the nationalisms but rather as evidence of weakness and fear that propel politicians, with a self-assurance deficit, to be obsessively fascinated with a territory. As he emphatically observes, the content filling this discourse is by no means imposed on science from the outside. Duančić perceives it instead as an effect of the mechanisms inherent to professional reflection on space – particularly in geopolitics (though not only). This is all about

an interpretation of even the slightest facts that leads, in an apparently alternativeless way, to great authoritative theories.

Apart from this reasonable, though not quite optimistic, reflection, the Croatian historian's book offers a handful of other interesting thoughts whose significance goes beyond the local Yugoslav history. Duančić repeatedly stresses the close ties between geography and ethnopsychology, characteristic of the discourse concerned. Even in (a number of) studies by professional geographers, maps have proved inferior to speculations on a nation's character and spirit. As Duančić remarks, at this particular point, the Yugoslav geographical discourse differed from its German counterpart, where professional cartography played a more considerable role. It seems to me that a similar argument would be defensible for certain other interwar countries; it would now be the task for scholars to determine to what extent this difference was based on practical premises – like the fact that it was Germany and Austria that housed the best publishing houses specialising in cartography. The other aspect, certainly worth confronting against the available material, is the aforementioned tension between geographers (particularly, advocates of geopolitics) and ethnographers. Duančić points out to the correlation of the methodological and the political conflict. To simplify, it can be stated that geographers more frequently found nationalists more familiar to themselves, whereas ethnographers, as if following the object of their studies, often associated themselves with the peasants' movement. As it seems, both the Hungarian and the Romanian cases, with rural sociology seeing an extremely dynamic development in the interwar years, confirm this conclusion to some degree. The sections on Filip Lukas's comparative theories, whereby Poles and Czechs psychologically and civilisationally corresponded, respectively, with Croats and Serbs, will undoubtedly be interesting not only to geographical historians.

As a rule, each particular, be it the most eccentric, theory analysed in this book is embedded with a solid dose of information regarding its political and scholarly context. It very rarely happens that the author neglects his duties or loses the trail by looking for a faraway context instead of a much closer one. This occurs with the metaphors typical of geopolitics, such as 'citadel' (also, 'backbone', 'stronghold', or 'artery'). Although the information that a 'mountain citadel' was mentioned, in the context of Yugoslavia, by French geographer Yves Haumant is certainly interesting, one should bear in mind his fellow countryman Emmanuel de Martonne, who had used such metaphors with reference to the Balkans earlier on, and more frequently, being an influential scientist, valued expert – and, a good acquaintance of Cvijić. Another such case concerns the role of space in the development and collapse of the state. In his discussion of Lukas's views on this subject matter, Duančić refers to Georgi Plekhanov but admits that one may doubt whether the Croatian geographer might indeed have been inspired by the Russian Marxist's thought. Indeed, there was a much larger host of thinkers

writing of ‘destructive space’, and some among them must have been read by Lukas. Though rare, such ‘defects’ stand out in the text, once the reader has got accustomed to a reliable contextualisation offered by the author, instead of loose associations. Fortunately, they are really sporadic.

Altogether, Vedran Duančić’s book is not only a deftly written elaboration of the subject-matter, based on extensive and penetratingly analysed material that forms part of a relatively recent current in the research into East Central European history. The importance of this study does not boil down, either, to its being a simple complementation of our knowledge of the history of twentieth-century geography with a little-known Yugoslavian chapter. This author has more on offer, though he does not show it off. As has been remarked, understanding the motivations and line(s) of thinking of interwar geopoliticians speaks not only of themselves but also of the ideas that reappeared as predominant in the region’s public space in the early 1990s – and fare quite well today also. It is worth realising that a very similar intellectual heritage burdens each of the national varieties of geography as well as related sciences, such as ethnography. Analysis of the opinions of politically involved Croatian, Slovene, and Serbian scholars has shown the strength of a mobilising potential, also in its destructive sense that rests in some old theories, maps, and tables. Before we yield to the fresh and daring analyses provided by political scientists, and get carried away by them, we had better get to know more about their origins and historical merits.

transl. *Tristan Korecki*

Maciej Górny

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

Евелина Джевиецка [Ewelina Drzewiecka], *Юбилейно и модерно. Кирило-методиевският разказ през социализма в България*, София, 2020, Кирило-Методиевският научен център при БАН, 232 pp., bibliography, ill.; series: Кирило-Методиевски студии, 29

Ewelina Drzewiecka’s monograph *Jubilee and Modern. The Cyrillo-Methodian Narrative during Socialism in Bulgaria* explores the Cyrillo-Methodian cult and its ideological appropriations during the socialist period in Bulgaria (1944–1989). The analysis focuses on a selection of scholarly, popular, and ecclesiastical volumes whose publication marked important anniversaries related to the two Byzantine missionaries and their pupils. Among the most significant publications are the article collections: *100 years since the first celebration of May 24* (1957); *1100 years since the creation of the Slavic alphabet* (1963); *1100 years since the death of Constantine-Cyril, the Philosopher* (1969); *1150 years since the birth of Constantine-Cyril, the Philosopher* (1977); *1300 years*

since the establishment of the Bulgarian State (1983); and *1100 years since the death of Methodius* (1985).

This erudite study combines the historiographical method with literary, linguistic, and cultural analysis and promises to break new ground in our understanding of the formative role of the Cyrillo-Methodian narrative within the socialist grand narrative.

The book comprises an introduction, four chapters, and a conclusion. Chapter One, titled 'The Culture of the Jubilee Commemorations', introduces Jan and Aleida Assmann's theory of cultural memory as an interpretative framework of the festive commemorations of the Cyrillo-Methodian legacy. Drzewiecka underlines the ritualistic nature of the anniversary volumes, which supports their formative (national identification) function in the totalitarian state.

Chapter Two, 'The Enlightener', discusses the stories about the life and work of Constantine-Cyril contained in the socialist volumes and argues that these narratives set the structure of the Cyrillo-Methodian master narrative. The author points out some of the characteristic features of the Constantine-Cyril plot: (1) an emphasis on the continuity of the cultural legacy of the two brothers throughout the centuries and its important role in the National Revival and the nation formation processes; (2) a reinterpretation of the religious nature of the Cyrillo-Methodian mission as socially progressive; and (3) undermining the role of the Byzantine influence and highlighting the originality of Constantine-Cyril's work. The author concludes that although the essence and the function of the Cyrillo-Methodian narrative remain fundamentally unchanged despite the shifting historical and socio-political circumstances, some tendencies toward semantic modulations and the accumulation of new meanings can be observed. Thus Drzewiecka proposes to survey the specifics of the socialist Cyrillo-Methodian ideal in three micro-periods: the 1950s, the 1960s, and 1970–1989.

In the transitional period of the 1950s, the most significant change of the narrative involved a switch in the emphasis from the narrowly Bulgarian symbolic meaning of Cyril and Methodius' mission to a broader Slavic significance in the spirit of socialist internationalism. The two jubilee publications from the 1950s, *Cyril and Methodius. 100 years since the first celebration of May 24th* (1957), and the fictionalised account of the lives of the two missionary brothers (1957) by N. Nikitov focus on the notion of the revolution and the adoption of the socialist values of equality and brotherhood among the nations.

The 1960s were a time of economic, political, and cultural liberalisation, and the jubilee publications from that period contain two important characteristics: a continued oscillation between the national and pan-Slavic significance of the Cyrillo-Methodian legacy, but with increased attention paid to the Bulgarian context; and a growing interest in the enlightening role of the mission of the two apostles.

In the last socialist micro-period, between 1970 and 1989, the keyword for the jubilee editions is ‘culture’, and this motif is intimately connected with Ludmila Zhivkova’s cultural politics. A new, more universal perspective, propagating world peace, equality, and spiritual progress takes the central stage and overshadows the traditional pan-Slavic and Bulgarian-centric perspectives. After having reviewed the three micro-periods, Drzewiecka concludes that the socialist appropriation and semantic modification of the Cyrillo-Methodian narrative in line with the Marxist ideology for the purposes of legitimization of the political regime was a natural development and was similar to the processes of appropriation and actualisation which took place during the times of the National Revival and the interwar period.

Chapter Three, ‘The Executer’, attempts to answer the question of why Methodius occupied a secondary place in the dyad and attracted considerably less attention than his younger brother. Drzewiecka posits that Constantine-Cyril’s plot overshadows that of Methodius because the former is perceived as a genius creator and the latter as an executer, i.e. an implementer of his younger brother’s creation. Methodius’ contributions are mainly seen in his work as an archbishop and translator of the Bible – contributions that did not sit well with the communist ideology. The stronger emphasis placed on education and culture rather than on evangelisation and faith resulted in the secularisation of the cult of Sts Cyril and Methodius during socialism. Concentrating on the autonomy of the creative human spirit, the socialist Cyrillo-Methodian narrative becomes a truly modern narrative, promoting enlightenment and a strong national identity.

The final Chapter Four, ‘The Heirs’, explores the place of the Bulgarian disciples of Cyril and Methodius in the master narrative. Drzewiecka claims that the disciples played a major role in the actualisation of the Cyrillo-Methodian narrative in the 1960s because of their ideological potential as educators and enlighteners and their connection to the revered figure of Prince Boris I. Therefore, the disciples’ narrative highlights the Bulgarian contribution to the progressive mission of Cyril and Methodius and serves as a source of national pride, revealing the fusion of the nationalist and the Marxist discourses, which the author defines as “communist nationalism”.

In her conclusion, Drzewiecka notes that although the Cyrillo-Methodian narrative preserved its general meaning and function throughout the socialist period, the individual micro-periods show some semantic shifts that can be characterised by the keywords ‘revolution’ for the 1950s; ‘enlightenment’ for the 1960s; and ‘culture’ for the 1970–89 period. These emphases correspond with the three dimensions of the Cyrillo-Methodian legacy: the pan-Slavic, the Bulgarian, and the universal, which are unified in the ultimate purpose of enlightening the masses. Thus, the jubilee publications demonstrate the type of commemorative practice dialectic of repetition and variation serving the contemporaneous ideological needs: ‘Soviet internationalism’, ‘communist

nationalism' and 'holistic ecumenism.' Drzewiecka argues that semantic actualisation is a natural attribute of cultural memory and is characteristic of every epoch and every political order and thus should not be discussed in pejorative terms, such as 'manipulation of the past.' This observation challenges the traditional understanding of the socialist period as the time of ideological oppression and conformity. Drzewiecka further problematises the use of terminology in the scholarly discourse about the Cyrillo-Methodian legacy by pointing out the need for a constant contextualisation of the Western-centric notions of 'modernity', 'nationalism', 'secularisation', and 'religion' in order to avoid any kind of reductionism. For example, she argues that in the Bulgarian context, it is much more productive to view secularisation not as a rejection of religious practices and of the Church as a public institution but as a differentiation between the spiritual and the political social spheres. In that sense, the Cyrillo-Methodian narrative provides an opportunity for a critical reevaluation of the scholarly discourse, which, as the author points out, needs to adjust the operative categories of modernity to the specific cultural context and reflect the nuances in their meaning.

Ewelina Drzewiecka's monograph is an original study that scrutinises the well-explored subject of the Cyrillo-Methodian legacy from several fresh perspectives – sociological, cultural, and philosophical – thus opening new research venues in the fields of medieval studies and history. The book draws on insights from memory studies (Jan and Aleida Assmann, Maurice Halbwachs), history (Allan Megill), hermeneutics (Paul Ricoeur), sociology (Pierre Bourdieu), and social anthropology (Mary Douglas) and will be of interest to a wide range of humanities specialists.

proofreading James Hartzell

Svetlana Vassileva-Karagyozyova

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2641-2551>