

REVIEWS

Acta Poloniae Historica
116, 2017
PL ISSN 0001-6829

Todd M. Endelman, *Leaving the Jewish Fold: Conversion and Radical Assimilation in Modern Jewish History*, Princeton University Press, Oxford and Princeton, 2015, 440 pp.

Todd M. Endelman is professor emeritus of history and Judaic studies at the University of Michigan. He is the author of, among other works, *Radical Assimilation in Anglo-Jewish History, 1656–1945* (1990), and *The Jews of Britain, 1656–2000* (2002). *Leaving the Jewish Fold* is his most recent publication. It is a study on radical assimilation in modern Jewish history, and the result of his many years of research into the phenomena.

The publication is divided into eight chapters and covers, in great detail, over three hundred years of a varied and complex history. The work is of a synthetic nature, and employs a highly comparative approach. It provides the reader with a picture of modern conversion in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the West (France, the Netherlands, Great Britain and the United States). The author deliberately omitted – in order to go into more detail in his work – such countries as Switzerland, Italy, the Scandinavian countries, and French and British enclaves outside Europe, such as Algeria, South Africa, and Australia. The analysis also excludes the Jewish communities in Canada and Latin America.

The expression ‘radical assimilation’ is an umbrella term referring to various routes by which Judaism and the past were erased, lost or – as Endelman puts it – ‘buried’. It includes conversion, secession (an act of formal withdrawal from the community), mixed marriages, and other forms of losing contact with one’s Jewish descent which was often seen as a burden.

According to the author, the decisions about conversions were not linked to character ‘flaws’ (cravenness, cowardice) that were more visible among some groups of Jews than others. They were rather – as he posits – “determined by how Jews viewed their present and future chances for success and happiness while remaining Jewish” (p. 7). For this reason, the author identifies those cultural ideals, social structures, and political systems that allowed Jews to participate in social and civic life without having to conceal or jettison their ties to the Jewish community.

It is vital that, although the American author refers to antisemitism, he changes the vector of questions and approaches this issue differently: he emphasizes its social reception, and not its character and the ways in which

it was revealed (in culture, politics, etc.). In contrast to several generations of Jewish historians, who generally used to condemn the converts, Endelman avoids judging, since he assumes that it is unproductive (in terms of analytics). He tries not to get trapped by the older meta-history – a Zionist one, which draws a critical picture of the diaspora in the pre-war and war period – and its antithesis, which gives the diaspora a positive value regarding its creativity when it came to survival and preserving the Jewish identity (despite the decreasing meaning of knowledge and religious practices). *Leaving the Jewish Fold* attempts to restore the balance of living in a diaspora.

The book is only partially based on statistical data, in part because some of the records did not survive, and in part because of the fact that in the West the relationship between the state and the churches was different than in Central Europe. The state did not monitor the religious movement of its citizens, and required neither religious affiliation nor registration of the act of leaving or joining a new religious group. In the absence of conversion statistics for liberal states, Endelman must turn to non-quantitative evidence. He draws information about the scope and character of radical assimilation from ‘anecdotal’ or ‘literary’ sources: memoirs, diaries, correspondence, newspapers, journals, sermons, tracts, and novels.

In the first chapter (‘Conversion in Medieval and Early Modern Europe’) the author presents a brief overview of medieval conversions, emphasizing the political and religious context that conditioned the status of Judaism and its followers. He considers the turning point to be the year 381 A.D., when Christianity became a state religion. The author claims that without the support of secular power the new religion (creating the mythical view of a Jew) would not have had any influence on the life of Jews. Previously, the Jewish leaders could ignore the new religion and its claims. The change in its status meant a radical redefinition of the position of Jews, namely their marginalization (in the societies they lived in) and stigmatization (regarding both their thought and culture). According to Endelman, those two facts constituted the background of the history of conversion up to the twentieth century. He views Paul’s (Saul of Tarsus’s) conversion as utterly atypical. “It occurred in a context in which Jews had not been marginalized for centuries. Whatever the meaning of Paul’s transformative experience for the sociology or psychology of religion, it is not paradigmatic for the history of Jewish conversion in Christian Europe” (p. 22). This is one of the most crucial theses presented in the paper, and it diversifies the fixed division into compulsory and voluntary, spiritual and pragmatic.

Chapters 2–5 constitute the main axis of the book. Chapters 2 and 3 (the former discussing conversion in the time of Enlightenment and emancipation, and the latter presenting it during the period when the liberal course was abandoned) define the modern type of conversion by explaining the context of a given time and place. The author describes its specificity and contrasts it

with the conditions of the pre-modern diaspora, which was characterized by social and cultural consistency and autonomy, clearly defined borders (between the Jewish communities and the surroundings), and the lack of 'neutral' or 'half-neutral' societies, i.e. places where individuals from both groups could interact voluntarily, freely and spontaneously. This changed in modern times, and this 'correction' is the main object of the author's considerations.

While explaining it, Endelman exposes the role of the changes in Europe, the modification of the social system and the importance of the French Revolution that inspired the emancipation movement. The author rightly emphasizes the *modus* of incorporating the Jews in the Western world – not as a coherent, separate group, but as individuals (deprived of autonomy and incorporated into a web of regulation). He accurately notes that leaving the partially self-imposed isolation implies changes in auto-perception, including the way in which Jews want to perceive themselves and how they want to be perceived by others. He also points out that the emancipation gesture is one of homogenization, of imposing a universal order. Regrettably, Endelman does not develop this idea further.

In the chapters that constitute the core of the book, the historian explains why the conversions, theoretically useless with respect to the equalization of legal statuses, still happened in practice. According to the author, they took place because emancipation did not translate into social acceptance ("the improvement of legal status does not necessarily mean the improvement of social status", p. 67) – particularly (but not only) in Central and Eastern Europe, where the late implementation of emancipation coincided with the new form of antisemitism, which destroyed the guarantee of equality and the constantly-emphasized and increasing aspirations and hopes for social acceptance (fuelled by the Enlightenment).

I find it particularly valuable that the author emphasizes the great role of the emotional sphere (despite the fact this topic is not much discussed). By exposing the emotions, the author questions the conventional knowledge that conversion was caused by material needs and calculation. Endelman proves that a significant number of conversions were not 'driven' by impoverishment (quite often these converts were very rich), but by an incomplete, ambivalent acceptance. This was particularly true of the representatives of the middle class who, we may assume, are characterized by a greater need for respect.

The baptism constituted a hope for lifting the burden of a stigma, the last sign of strangeness, and escaping social isolation; "the emotional hurt that motivated them, were themselves novel, a product of the age, for they derived from a sense of identification with and admiration for the larger society and at the same time alienation from and distaste for Jewish tradition" (p. 62). Endelman entertainingly illustrates how Jewishness becomes a taboo; it is unwanted and embarrassing (in my opinion the latter deserves some deeper investigation).

Chapters 4 ('Defection and Drift – Early- and Mid-Twentieth Century') and 5 ('Integration and Inter-marriage – Mid-century to the Present') present in a panoramic fashion the evolution of the problem during the time of open hostility and after the Second World War. Chapter 6 ('Conversions of Conviction') is focused on authentic conversions, not on those who escaped 'the handicap of Jewishness', but on those who changed their faith spontaneously and honestly. Endelman emphasizes the fact that although not typical, they have attracted more attention on the part of researchers. As he did previously, he again warns us against easy binary oppositions (conversions driven by money or spirituality, secular and religious, egoistic and noble ones) and states convincingly that "converts whose piety was exemplary were not immune to the emotional and social disabilities of Jewishness, even if they did not acknowledge their role when they embraced Christianity. How could it be otherwise? Christian representations of Judaism and Jewishness were inseparable. The ways in which converts viewed their old and new faith were not the outcome of a speculative process that took place in vacuum. High-minded converts internalized and employed the negative evaluations of Judaism of the day" (p. 277).

Chapter 7 ('Neither Jew nor Christian – New Religions, New Creeds') presents an interesting overview of other religious or quasi-religious ways of solving the integration crisis. The author follows people who rejected both religions, yet believe that religion itself is necessary, spiritually and ethically, and necessary, in terms of society and politics, to solve the afore-mentioned crises, as well as others. Endelman follows people who tried to transgress the limits of existing religions and make the dream of a new, more universalist religion, come true. Although they are often ephemeral or fail to go beyond visionary plans, according to the author "[t]hey vividly testify to the pervasive power of the integrationist impulse within European and American Jews in the century and a half between the French Revolution and World War II" (p. 276).

The final diagnoses by Endelman are not disappointing. He perceives radical assimilation as a sign of failures; the limits of emancipation and tolerance. While writing about the Diaspora, the historian in fact is diagnosing (as was done by others in different contexts) the illnesses affecting the body of modern societies – their oppressiveness, exclusiveness, and the primacy placed on homogenization, where Other could potentially become Own, provided that they were eager to become somebody else and, in fact, deny themselves and their past.

The idea behind the work is not limited to the experiences of converts – its analysis also brings us knowledge (the dilemmas, emotions and identity) about those who, despite their distress, did not choose to undertake a radical gesture of adaptation. Understood this way, *Leaving the Jewish Fold* is a story about the Jewish identity in modernity. Its main value is the suggestion that there was another, less vivid, kind of mental abuse that was not good for ethnic pride and emotional balance.

In spite of the undeniable value of this work, it causes the reader (albeit only at some points) to reflect on certain (minor) drawbacks. While writing about the limits of emancipation, the author does not refer to the Enlightenment itself and the philosophical discourse of modernity. Does this mean that he locates the problem of exclusiveness/intolerance apart from them? References to the theses of Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer (the Enlightenment) and Zygmunt Bauman (the dark sides of modernity itself) might be useful. My second remark refers to the sphere of emotions. In my opinion, the presentation of this topic is the most valuable aspect of this work. It would be useful to refer to the existing source literature (through a reference to more general issues, like the protection of self-esteem) in order to strengthen the author's own diagnoses, which are very intriguing. It would also be interesting to refer to symbolic violence (Pierre Bourdieu) apart from the mental abuse described.

proofreading James Hartzell

Paweł Jasnowski

Armin Kohnle and Uwe Schirmer (eds.), in cooperation with Heiner Lück, Margit Scholz, Thomas A. Seidel and André Thieme, *Kurfürst Friedrich der Weise von Sachsen. Politik, Kultur und Reformation*, Sächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart, Leipzig and Stuttgart, 2015, pp. 455, index of places and names, ill. and tables; series: Quellen und Forschungen zur sächsischen Geschichte, 40

Frederick III, Elector of Saxony (1463–1525), was certainly one of the most interesting figures of the early Reformation era. He was a symbol of authority in the period of transition between the Middle Ages and Early modern period, serving as imperial general of the Holy Roman Empire, making the obligatory expedition to the Holy Land (1493), building a huge collection of relics, founding the University of Wittenberg, and almost taking the imperial crown. However, the Elector of Saxony has most notably gone down in history for serving as Martin Luther's protector, a figure whom, legend has it, he never actually met in person. He instead maintained contact with the reformer through his secretary Georg Spalatin. Frederick's other achievements have been overshadowed by the charismatic figure of Luther, which might explain why the most recent in-depth academic monograph on his rule was Ingetraut Ludolph's 1984 book.¹

¹ See the most recent edition: Ingetraut Ludolph, *Friedrich der Weise. Kurfürst von Sachsen 1463–1525* (Leipzig, 2006).

This volume, edited by Armin Kohnle and Uwe Schirmer, seeks to depict Frederick beyond the context of Martin Luther. This is not entirely surprising given that the articles were presented and discussed at a 2013 conference in Torgau, organized to mark the 550th anniversary of the ruler's birth. This certainly gives the volume added coherence, although readers might still feel disorientated by the fact that sixteen of the twenty two articles published here had already appeared in another post-conference volume published in 2014 but edited by different scholars.² The edited volume discussed here is not simply an expanded version of the earlier publication, since Andreas Tacke's article, for example, on the subject of images of Frederick ('Marketing Frederick. Friedrich der Weise in der bildenden Kunst seiner Zeit') was already published in a slightly extended version in 2014 that included the illustrations he analyses, which are missing from this 2015 volume. Giving the benefit of the doubt, it should be noted from the outset that this book deserves a highly favourable review, since it embodies all the best qualities of an edited volume: it synthesizes the results of in-depth analytical source-based studies from experts in various disciplines applying diverse methods.

The volume is constructed transparently and logically. The studies are arranged around three central thematic blocks: firstly, Frederick and his politics; secondly, culture and humanism; and, thirdly, piety and the Reformation. It is worth noting that the third section is the shortest, comprising only four articles, thus indicating the intention to shift focus towards Frederick and away from Luther.

In the first part of the book, the contributors address the question of the origins of Frederick's political significance. Armin Kohnle ('Kaiser, Reichstag, Reichsreform. Friedrich der Weise und das Reich') presents Frederick's relations with the Holy Roman Empire in the context of his visits to the Imperial diet, his relationship with Emperors Maximilian I and Charles V, as well as his position on reforming the Empire. Kohnle presents Frederick as a ruler who was not only omnipresent in the Empire, personally attending over half of the diets between 1486 and 1524, while sending a representative to the rest (see table on pp. 21–2). The Elector of Saxony also used the arena of diets to build a network of connections and relationships and, thanks to his flawless memory, he could recall events, statements and people years later. Although he has often been depicted as an opponent of the Habsburgs as Elector, Frederick was considered an impartial mediator and loyal political partner ("ehrlicher Makler", p. 17) from the moment he took up his first posts in the court of Emperor Maximilian.

² Dirk Syndram, Yvonne Fritz and Doreen Zerbe (eds.), *Kurfürst Friedrich der Weise von Sachsen (1463–1525). Beiträge zur wissenschaftlichen Tagung vom 4. bis 6. Juli 2014 auf Schloss Hartenfels in Torgau* (Dresden, 2014).

His thirty years of political activity culminated in the imperial elections of 1518/19, in which Emperor Maximilian wanted to force through the election of his grandson, the young Charles Habsburg, King of the Netherlands, as his successor. The accepted view in historiography is that Frederick could have taken the imperial crown at this point but did not do so, perhaps because of the heretic under his protection. Since the turn of the twentieth century, Polish researchers have also stressed the role of the Jagiellonian court and Sigismund I, as the protector of the juvenile Bohemian king, as a factor in the election of Charles V. Frederick's actions are presented in exceptional detail by Heiner Lück ('Friedrich der Weise und die Königswahl von 1519'), who reconstructs events to present a wonderfully engaging image of political rivalries among the great powers and their agents, while also including lawyers' opinions and expert reports. In the course of this rivalry, Frederick appears as someone deeply bound to the Holy Roman Empire's constitution, as defined by the Golden Bull, guaranteeing electors a free vote on the emperor. Political correspondence cannot, though, answer why the Elector, despite strong support, failed to take the crown.

This impression is confirmed by further articles analysing the Elector's politics within the complicated structure of the Saxon territories that were divided into two parts in 1485: the electoral Ernestine lands and the Albertine principality. A separate domain was carved out within the Electorate of Saxony in 1513, then ruled by Frederick, as a result of *Mutschierung*, with this territory put under the control of his brother Johann the Steadfast. Following Luther's actions, further Reformation-influenced differences were imposed on this complex political structure: Frederick remained loyal to the Church but defended Luther; Johann was a supporter of the new teachings; and Georg firmly opposed Luther, offering his support to anti-Lutheran polemicists. Christian Winter analyses the relationship between the Elector and his brother Johann ('Kurfürst Friedrich der Weise und sein Bruder Herzog Johann'), while Enno Bünz looks into the relationship with the ruler of Albertine Saxony, Georg ('Nähe und Distanz: Friedrich der Weise und Herzog Georg von Sachsen, 1486–1525'). Michael Scholz's essay considers relations with the bishops of Magdeburg, one of whom was another of Frederick's brothers, Ernst ('Familiäre Bindung und dynastische Konkurrenz. Friedrich der Weise und die Erzbischöfe von Magdeburg'). According to Winter, carving out a separate domain within Ernestine Saxony was an administrative rather than political decision, with both rulers engaged in consensual and harmonious politics. The transformed political landscape in the Empire following the German Peasants' Wars coincided with Frederick's death and Johann taking power, which led to Saxony becoming an open supporter of the Reformation throughout the Empire. Interestingly, relations with Georg, who opposed Luther, remained cordial within the Saxon dynasty (p. 134). Frederick ensured that relations with the archbishops of Magdeburg, including his

brother Ernst, were as good as those with Albrecht of Brandenburg. Despite the tension between Halle and Wittenberg at this time – resulting from dynastic competition and, following Luther's actions, confessional differences – relations were nevertheless maintained (pp. 149–52). The image of a peaceful and balanced policy is confirmed by Frederick's involvement in the cause of the Teutonic Order in Prussia (Stephan Flemming, 'Friedrich der Weise und der deutsche Orden in Preußen, 1486–1525') and by his relations with the imperial cities, as shown in Sina Westphal's case study on the strong bonds tying electoral Saxony to Nuremberg ('Außenpolitische Korrespondenz. Friederich der Weise und die Reichstadt Nürnberg').

Frederick's reign in Saxony is sometimes depicted as a transitional period between the medieval mode of power, exerted by a court and a ruler who travels throughout his domain, and a modern model, in which a ruler creates an administrative centre for governing a country. The Ernestine line of the House of Wettin imagined Wittenberg in this role, with the city taking over many functions once held by Leipzig, which found itself in the Albertine part of the state. However, as research by Thomas Lang, Uwe Schirmer and Jürgen Herzog ('Zwischen Reisen und Residieren'; 'Der kursächsische-ernestinische Fürstenhof unter Friedrich dem Weisen, 1485–1525'; 'Fürstlicher Hof und Stadt Torgau während der Regierungszeit Friedrich des Weisen') convincingly argues, the Wettin court, which counted 80 people and 80 horses in 1456, remained mobile, travelling between its main residences in Meissen, Leipzig, Altenburg, Weimar and Dresden, with smaller seats in Torgau, Lochau and Schellenberg. Frederick's court was composed of between 130 (1503) and 230 (1508) people, managing to cover up to 3400 kilometres a year (p. 234). These observations are confirmed by the dates on documents issued and also by property inventories, receipts of court kitchens, and other sources ('Küchenbuch, Reisebuch, Lagerbuch'). Frederick the Elector rarely visited Wittenberg, where the booming university played host to Luther, and when he did visit, he spent little time there (p. 228).

The history of the founding and development of the university is presented comprehensively and convincingly in Manfred Rudersdorf's contribution, 'Kurfürst Friedrich der Weise und die Anfänge der Leucorea in Wittenberg'. 416 students enrolled during the first year of its activities, while 800 were enrolling annually by the mid-sixteenth century (p. 256). Wittenberg quickly became a symbol of the revival in both the education system and theology, initially within the frameworks of humanism and *devotio moderna*, which were represented by Christoph Scheurl and Johannes von Staupitz, and then later in connection to the Reformation and humanism, as embodied by Luther and Philipp Melanchthon. Despite Melanchthon never having met the Elector of Saxony in person, the speeches that he prepared on the occasion of Frederick's funeral (1525) and on the anniversary of his death (1551) were highly influential in shaping the image of the ruler. As Hans-Peter Hasse

suggests, it is thanks to Melanchthon that Frederick acquired the sobriquet “the Wise” (‘Melanchthon und Kurfürst Friederich der Weise. Konstruktion der Fürstenmemoria’).

It is symbolic of the volume that the section on the Reformation is the shortest and comes at the end. The policies of Frederick and his successors, Johann the Steadfast and Johann Frederick I, are presented in an article by one of the leading experts on the subject, Eike Wolgast (‘Die deutschen Fürsten vor der Herausforderung durch die frühe Reformation’), who places these figures in the context of imperial princes’ attitudes towards the Reformation. Of greatest interest to researchers dealing with the Reformation will be the closing article by Bernd Stephan on the subject of Frederick’s ambivalent relations to Luther (‘Friedrich der Weise und Luther: Distanz und Nähe’). Referring to the characterization of Frederick presented in Melanchthon’s speeches, the biography by Spalatin and Johannes Eck’s correspondence, Stephan depicts the Elector’s attachment to a traditional mode of religiosity which gradually moves towards finding common ground with Luther through the shared traditions of humanism, Biblicism and profound piety.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate the very positive assessment of the volume presented at the outset. This collection offers an exceptionally valuable summary of many monographic studies that draw on a still largely unknown source base. While the publication happens to coincide with the anniversary of the Reformation, a fact that will contribute to a lively reception of the volume, the editors have skilfully, perhaps overly so, managed to avoid the trap whereby ‘anniversary publications’ focus almost entirely on Luther. The articles presented in this volume might occasionally drown readers in details and reconstructions of events, although this is surely a price that readers are willing to pay in order to have access to new findings based on in-depth and reliable source analysis. While not presenting Frederick the Wise in an entirely new light, this publication ensures that the image of him becomes more refined and nuanced, and acquires greater depth. A certain disadvantage of focusing on the ruler’s person, however, is the tendency for some authors to adopt an overly psychologizing approach that exceeds the knowledge that can be derived from sources (e.g. pp. 434–5). Given the dangers posed by such approaches, the editors’ strategy is to ensure that he is depicted constantly in interaction with other rulers and members of his court and family. This guarantees that the volume offers a significant contribution to research on the political and social background to events in the Reformation, sixteenth-century court culture, and the modern history of the Empire.

Tomasz Gromelski, Christian Preusse, Alan Ross, and Damien Tricoire (eds.), *Frühneuzeitliche Reiche in Europa. Das Heilige Römische Reich und Polen-Litauen im Vergleich. Empires in Early Modern Europe. The Holy Roman Empire and Poland-Lithuania in Comparison*, Harrassowitz Verlag, Deutsches Historisches Institut Warschau, Wiesbaden, 2016, 264 pp.; series: Quellen und Studien, 32

Resulting from a 2011 conference held at the Polish Academy of Sciences' Centre for Historical Research in Berlin, this volume opens with Christian Preusse's introduction, 'Towards a comparison of the Holy Roman Empire and Poland-Lithuania in the early modern period – potentials and pitfalls'. The very first sentence already makes clear that the editors' aim was not to produce a complete comparative overview of the structures and functions of the Polish-Lithuanian Republic and the Holy Roman Empire in the modern period, but rather to indicate the potential of comparative research on them. Attempts at research on modern 'composite states' always run the risk seeming deceptively simple, while much depends on choosing appropriate questions and correctly setting their scope. These same problems apply to research on the two states explored here. The editors set out three central spheres of research: political assemblies; executive power – monarchies and noble courts; and, finally, relations between politics and religion. While risky, particularly in relation to institutions, this choice is well-justified. Beyond outlining the aims and scope of the research, Christian Preusse also presents a comprehensive overview of existing literature. He indicates the most evident structural similarities in both states, while also summarizing the contents of the essays in this edited volume. He concludes by highlighting the problems involved in comparative research, while also stressing the volume's preliminary nature.

The first part, titled 'Political Assemblies and constitutional debates', opens with Julia Burkhardt's essay, 'Spätmittelalterliche Reichsversammlungen in Polen und Deutschland' [Late Medieval imperial diets in Poland and Germany]. Following the introduction, where the author presents the comparisons of both states' political systems made in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, there comes a methodological outline and a literature review. This is followed by Burkhardt's description of the functioning of Polish and German parliamentarianism in the fifteenth century. The expansive outlines of both systems contrast with the limited comparative elements. The author reaches some rather obvious conclusions, arguing that the increasingly clear divergence between both systems, and in particular the increasing role of the Polish nobility since the end of the Middle Ages, influenced the cementation of the differences between the functions and roles performed by the Polish Sejm and German Reichstag.

Maciej Ptaszyński's contribution, 'Zwischen Gemeinwohl und Staatsraison. Das Widerstandsrecht in den Ständedebatten der polnisch-litauischen Republik im 16. Jahrhundert' [Between the common good and *raison d'état*. The right to resistance in debates in the estates in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the sixteenth century], also analyses the development of Polish political culture. The author explores a question that has not been dealt with in great detail by Polish historiography, despite the existence of a substantial Western European body of literature. By applying findings on late medieval developments relating to the right of subjects to resist, Ptaszyński focuses on the formation of attitudes towards the right to resist in the Reformation period and the age of constructing noble democracy in Poland. Particularly interesting here are the author's views on the thought of Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski and the influence of Calvinist ideas on Polish political culture. A central issue at stake here is how to explain the conditions during the *interregnum* following the death of King Sigismund Augustus in 1572 surrounding the genesis and enactment in the basic legal regulations of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (the Henrician Articles, the *pacta conventa* and the King's oath) of the right of the nobility to resist the future monarch should he not recognize the limitation of power imposed on him by representatives of the estates. In his conclusion, Ptaszyński rightly stressed the moderation of noble politicians and the significance of a mythologized version of noble ideology, which played such a crucial role in shaping the *ius de non praestanda oboedientia* under Sigismund III Vasa.

Horst Carl's contribution, 'Föderale Reichsstrukturen in vergleichender Absicht. Das Exempel des Heiligen Römischen Reiches mit Blick auf Polen-Litauen' [A comparative perspective on federal imperial structures. The Holy Roman Empire and Poland-Lithuania], focuses on questions relating to the federal tradition in German political culture. This is a very broad issue that is also of contemporary relevance, thus it comes as no surprise that the author has restricted his presentation of the matter to an overview of contemporary German historians' views. He begins by restating Reinhart Koselleck's position on the subject of the genesis and development of German federalism, before outlining the views of historians including Karl Otmar von Aretin, Otto von Gierke, Peter Blickle and Heinz Schilling. He pays particular attention to those historians who find the origins of the relational structures of the Reich in late-medieval agreements aiming at guaranteeing public peace, i.e. *Landfrieden*. These local pacts offering mutual guarantees of peace in the modern era evolved into state-wide regulations and even acquired international standing, first at the Peace of Augsburg in 1555 and then with the Treaties of Westphalia in 1648. Carl also gives some indication of the relations between the medieval federal tradition and the ideology of modern republicanism, as well as the opposition between Protestant and Catholic interpretations of the Reich's legal code in the seventeenth and eighteenth

centuries. His study lacks, however, significant comparative elements, although the author does note in conclusion that in Polish political thought, federalist ideology played a significantly smaller role than in the Reich.

Edward Opaliński's laconically-titled contribution, 'Confederation and *rokosz*', explores questions that have been at the margins of his long-standing interest in the political culture of the Polish nobility. Beginning with an outline of the two fundamental modes of power in the Commonwealth, namely *regnum* – under a ruling king – and *interregnum*, he proceeds to present rule by noble confederations in the period between the death of a monarch and the election of a successor. The legal order established in three successive *interregna*, following the death of Sigismund Augustus in 1572, Henry Valois' abdication in 1576, and the death of Stephen Báthory in 1586, was disrupted in the early seventeenth century by the *rokosz*, or a confederation formed during the king's lifetime and directed against his authority. Opaliński follows with an extensive discussion of the 1606 Sandomierz *rokosz* aimed against Sigismund III Vasa. He depicts its origins, actions and ideology, arguing that this third mode of power, which competed against the *regnum*, was a rebellion. The concluding part of the study features some interesting analogies to similar structures in the Holy Roman Empire from the thirteenth century until the Czech Confederation of 1619. Readers interested in the subject might find that there is insufficient information provided to enable differentiation of the Sandomierz *rokosz*, which Opaliński correctly identifies as exceptional in the history of the Commonwealth, from other noble confederations organized in the second half of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

The final contribution to this section of the book comes from British-based historian Jerzy Lukowski. 'Polish enlightened republicanism. The *Project for the Form of Government* – the official constitutional reform programme of the Four Years Sejm' presents a brief outline of one of the most important late eighteenth-century political projects, which was developed in 1790 and preceded the formulation of the Government Act, i.e. the 3 May Constitution of 1791. The Project's authors' primary goal was stabilizing Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth's political system. They sought to achieve this through political reforms, the most significant of which was the ultimate abolition of the *liberum veto*. Beyond the outline of the political reforms, Lukowski also recalls the plan for Enlightenment-inspired social and educational reforms. These foresaw an improvement in the political position of the burghers and raised the standards demanded of the nobility (education requirements), while, relatively speaking, offering peasants under feudal control the least. In spite of this, the Project was seen by the nobility in dietines (Pol.: *sejmiki*) as being too radical and was thus questioned. In conclusion, Lukowski presents a cautious thesis on the relationship between the reform-oriented proposals of the Project and the ideas of the German *Allgemeines Landrecht* of 1794.

The second part of the book, 'Monarchy, administration, and the royal court,' concentrates on institutions of power. It begins with Wojciech Krawczuk's short contribution, 'Die Kanzlei der Herrscher – reine Instrumente der Macht?' [The rulers' chancelleries – pure instruments of power?]. The author begins with details of existing research on the subject of the role of the chancelleries of Polish and German rulers, noting that as a result of reforms in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries they acquired the status, in a way, of 'central organs of public administration.' Krawczuk also suggests including Polish historians in research on the German Imperial chancellery, noting that until 1742 matters pertaining to Silesia came under the jurisdiction of the Czech chancery court. His study also features a comparison of sixteenth-century German and Polish chancellery reforms together with an outline of problems for further research emerging from the dispersal of the records of the chancellery of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Krawczuk ends on a discussion of the existing literature on the Polish crown chancellery and restates the need for research on 'private' and 'secret' chancelleries of contemporary rulers, while drawing attention to the modernization of the crown chancellery under Saxon rule in Poland.

Joanna Kodzik's study 'Zeremoniell und politische Ordnung in den Beziehungen zwischen Polen-Litauen und dem Heiligen Römischen Reich am Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts im Spiegel des Vermählungszeremoniell' investigates the issue of the 'visualization of power' in the Baroque. She argues, rightly, that public ceremonies at noble courts were a tool of the legitimization of power. She follows with a comparison of rituals in the Commonwealth and the Holy Roman Empire based on case studies of the marriage of Michael Korybut Wiśniowiecki to Eleonora Habsburg of Austria in 1670 and that of Maximilian II Emanuel to Teresa Kunegunda Sobieska in 1695. In conclusion, Kodzik highlights that despite the differing political objectives of both marriages, there are clear similarities on the symbolic level in both ceremonies. These resulted not only from the fact that they were Polish-German relationships, but also from the evident need to make reference to the dominant and legible 'code' for interpreting court rituals that permeated the entire European Baroque culture.

The final essay in this part of the book is Peter Collmer's '*L'ordre qu'on déteste*. Die königliche Tafel als sächsischer Brückenkopf in Polen-Litauen' [The royal board as a Saxon bridgehead in Poland-Lithuania]. Concealed behind this somewhat enigmatic title is an interesting study of the influences of Saxon administrative culture on managing crown property (tabular estates) in the Commonwealth under Saxon rule. Collmer presents evidence from as yet under-researched documents in Warsaw's Archiwum Kamestralne (Chamber Archive) and archives in Dresden. Following an analysis of the work of the administrative apparatus, by then dominated by Saxon specialists, managing the crown tabular estates within the Commonwealth, Collmer presents interesting conclusions regarding the scope of administrative

power and the freedom of decision-making in early-eighteenth-century court administration in the Commonwealth, while also offering insight into the influence of the Saxon Chamber (the Saxon bridgehead mentioned in the essay's title) on projects and practices of modernizing Polish-Lithuanian state administration. In conclusion, Collmer states that the Saxon system of estate management must have been sufficiently modern, since it was adopted after 1763 by Stanislas Augustus Poniatowski, who was designing structural reforms of the Polish-Lithuanian state.

The third part of the book, 'Religion, Kirchen und Politik. Religion, churches and politics', opens with Jürgen Heyde's contribution, '*Ad cautelam defensionis contra iudeos. Juden als Thema politischer Debatten im Königreich Polen in der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts*' [Jews as the subject of political debates in the Kingdom of Poland in the early sixteenth century]. The author underscores the importance of this theme, noting that in the sixteenth century both states saw the emergence of principles that would for a long time determine the conditions under which Jewish communities would function. He also restates the obvious need to differentiate rhetoric from social and political realities, before moving onto an outline of the debates, dividing participants into three groups. Beginning with the discourse among burghers, he notes that the most important role was played by inhabitants of large cities – Lviv, Cracow and Poznań, which was countering Jewish economic competition. The position of the nobility, meanwhile, was centred on political-legal aspects while also stressing the economic threat posed by the growing significance of Jewish trade. At the same time, noble discourse adopted many elements legitimizing the traditionally anti-Jewish attitude of the Catholic Church which, ultimately, took up a moderate position in this polemic, limiting itself to supporting burghers' demands. In conclusion, Heyde underscores how a traditionally anti-Jewish attitude prevailed among all participants in the debates, whose practical effects were shaped by political conditions and the estate-based differences in interests.

Igor Kąkolewski's contribution, '*Toleranz oder Tolerierung? Das Problem der Toleranz von Christen gegenüber Juden in Polen-Litauen vor dem Hintergrund des Alten Reiches vom 16. bis zur Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts*' [Tolerance or Toleration? The question of Christian tolerance of Jews in Polish-Lithuania in the context of the Holy Roman Empire from the sixteenth to mid-seventeenth century], begins with the observation that the question posed in the title of his essay was inspired by the way Polish-Jewish relations were framed in the project for the exhibition at POLIN, the Museum of the History of Polish Jews in Warsaw. He contrasts the traditional idealized image of Polish-Jewish relations in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (*paradisus Judaeorum*) with findings from research into practices of tolerating 'others' in modern European culture, leading him to enquire into the real place of Jews in the tolerant Polish political system. The concluding part of Kąkolewski's text

outlines the opinions existing on the subject of potential cohabitation versus merely tolerating Jews as expressed by the leading thinkers in Europe at the time. Here the author stresses strongly the need to overcome established stereotypes on this point.

In her contribution, 'Provinzialsynoden in den politischen Ordnungen des Alten Reiches und der polnisch-litauischen Adelsrepublik' [Provincial synods in the political orders of the Holy Roman Empire and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth], Elke Faber analyses one of the most important questions when investigating the system of Church-state relations, namely the influence of Catholic canon law on the way political systems worked. She begins with an analysis of the way Polish and German provincial Catholic synods functioned, while paying some attention to the influence of secular authorities on their discussions and legislation. Further on in the essay, she focuses on the Polish case, in particular relations between the synods and the Sejm. She stresses the role of synods in defending the interests of the Catholic clergy in the Commonwealth, primarily in relation to the contested subject of the taxation of clergy. The conclusion features fairly limited comparative analysis of the role of German and Polish provincial synods.

An interesting subject for future research is indicated by Damien Tricoire's chapter, 'Beyond the fundamentalism and tolerance narratives. Catholic representations of political-religious order and policy-making in the Holy Roman Empire and Poland-Lithuania (1620s–1640s)'. He aims to depict the views of supporters of the call to build a Catholic state in the Commonwealth and Holy Roman Empire at this time. This is a key issue given the thesis regarding the destructive influence of this idea on the Commonwealth's political system, where calling into question religious tolerance and the culture of political compromise disrupted the equilibrium that had been the foundation of noble democracy since the mid-sixteenth century. The author presents a short comparison of the Catholic political factions in the two states in the early seventeenth century, before focussing on the situation in the Holy Roman Empire, followed by his interpretation – drawing on Polish sources – of the religious policy of Ladislas IV Vasa and his political supporters. In contrast to many other contributions to this volume, Tricoire's is a genuinely comparative study.

Klemens Kaps' study, 'Aufklärung, religiöse Toleranz und Nützlichkeit. Die Neudefinition von Ordnungskonzepten des Judentums in Polen-Litauen und der Habsburgermonarchie (1770–92) – von Vergleich zum Transfer' [Enlightenment, religious tolerance and practicality. The redefinition of order in relation to Jews in Poland-Lithuania and the Habsburg monarchy (1770–92) – from comparison to transfer], completes the volume. Kaps attempts a comparison of Enlightenment-era conceptions of regulating the situation of Jewish populations in the Commonwealth and the Habsburg monarchy in the late eighteenth century. This apparently simple task, given the common reference point of Enlightenment ideology, proves difficult in practice, owing to the fundamental

differences in social structures and political systems. His investigation begins with a depiction of the historical context, i.e. the legal position of Jews, which leads into an outline of projects for 'Jewish reform' that made reference to the idea of tolerance or assimilation, while also stressing the need to 'socialize' Jews. In conclusion, the author explores in greater detail the question of the so-called 'productivization' of the Jewish population, which stressed the significance of economic motivations in reformist thought. It must be said that Kaps seems much more proficient in discussing the question of Jews under Habsburg rather than Polish rule, while some doubt must be cast on his findings given that he has failed to use the basic source of knowledge on Polish reformist discourse on the 'Jewish question', namely the collection *Lud żydowski w narodzie polskim* (Warszawa, 1994).

In conclusion, this is clearly an uneven collection, which is typical of conference-based edited volumes. A basic problem is the lack of comparative elements in many contributions, some of which make only a superficial attempt at comparison. Nevertheless, it could also be argued that those studies where the authors have conducted genuinely comparative investigations could form the foundation for discussions that might result in formulating a methodology for conducting this kind of analysis.

trans. Paul Vickers

Wojciech Kriegseisen

Tomasz Kempa, *Konflikty wyznaniowe w Wilnie od początku reformacji do końca XVII wieku* [Confessional Conflicts in Wilno from the Early Reformation Period to the Late Seventeenth Century], Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, Toruń, 2016, 800 pp., annex, bibliog., indices

The book under review is certainly an outstanding study. All the same, the author has made some minor errors or omissions and has not entirely well balanced his views or opinions, which I am going to prove below.

Tomasz Kempa is known to the milieu of Polish historians as an eminent expert in religious issues in the early modern-age Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. His most recent book has been meant as a comprehensive insight into the negative facet of the religious contacts in the capital city of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The core subject of this monograph is indeed an extremely interesting research area not only for historiographers but no less for sociologists, religion experts, or cultural anthropologists. Although for years it has been arousing interest among Polish as well as Lithuanian historians, it was not before the present book came out that it was researched in a satisfactory manner.

The monograph in question is composed of an introduction, eleven chapters, a conclusion, appendix, reference literature, list of illustrations, and index of personal names. The extensive appendix (pp. 667–719) comprises twenty-eight interesting documents related to the occurrences described in the book. Some of these documents have been published before, but mostly as part of foreign publications and therefore it has been the apt thing to include them in this particular appendix. Some individual documents come from the Raczyński Library of Poznań, the Czartoryski Library in Cracow, the Wróblewski Library of Vilnius and the Russian State Historical Archive in St. Petersburg, whilst a definite majority of them have been found by Kempa at the Central Archives of Historical Records in Warsaw and in the National Library of Lithuania. As to the latter place, all the documents concerning Reformed Protestants in Vilnius are available online on the Cultural Heritage of Lithuania website¹ (which clearly is not to the detriment of the Annex's content).

The Introduction explains the author's choice of the topic, summarises the literature and the other relevant sources. The proposed chronological caesuras are fairly acceptable, which also refers to the division of the period concerned into three segments, following Marcelli Kosman's concept of the development of the religious relations: i – “fast development of religious novelties in Lithuania”, until the arrival of the Jesuits in Wilno (1569); ii – “the confessions confronting one another”, concluded at the end of the sixteenth century; iii – “the moment the Reformation (and the Orthodoxy, as Kempa complements Kosman's categories) clearly recedes”, until mid-seventeenth century. The sources used in the monograph have been abundant, including printed and manuscript matter. The author has made use of manuscripts from archives and libraries in Poland as well as primarily in Vilnius, Moscow, Petersburg, L'viv, Kiev, and Minsk. An impressive collection of source publications complements the source-base picture.

The structure of the book is well thought-over, with the chronological-and-problem criterion coming to the fore. While most of the sections focus on the primary subject-matter, Chapter Ten (“The Jews of Wilno and the Łukiszki Tatars in the sixteenth to seventeenth century. Anti-Jewish tumults”) goes somewhat beyond the main framework as the argument includes confessors of the non-Christian religions at this point. Chapter Eleven takes the reader again into the complicated world of intra-Christian relations in Wilno, which is this time shown through the prism of last wills of certain dwellers of the city and the specificity of the local guilds.

The first chapter attempts to draw a picture of the Grand Duchy's multicultural capital before the Reformation. The focus is on the significance of Wilno, the nations or ethnicities populating it at the time, the city's urban layout

¹ <http://www.epaveldas.lt> [Accessed: 2 April 2018].

(which greatly influenced the character of the denomination-related riots) and its function as the capital city. This chapter, although one of the shortest, is certainly a valuable summary introducing the core of the monograph.

Chapter Two deals with the emergence and development of the Protestant communities in Wilno, the assumed cut-off moment being marked by the arrival of the Jesuits in the city in 1569. In my opinion, following the author's declared intent to render the periodisation proposed once by Kosman more detailed or specific, the date might have been shifted to 1579, particularly in the context of the 'conflicts' heralded in the title. The very fact of establishing the Jesuit Order in the area had no critical bearing on the emergence of severe tensions or clashes. Several disputes did occur, but no violent acts yet. The latter did not come before 1581, when the local students, just two years after their university was set up, were used to destroy the Evangelical publishing house and burn the books. As it thus seems, rather than the bringing over of the Jesuits, the setting up of the Wilno academy was of primary importance (true, under the Order's patronage and management), along with the bestowal of the justiciary privileges on the student youth.

Also the third chapter, which deals with the earliest stage of the Counter-Reformation and the first religious conflicts between the Catholics and the Reformed Evangelicals, extends to issues involving the local Jesuits. The chapter in question is one of the core sections in terms of the research problem under discussion, and is the largest one (volume-wise). The author meets there a serious challenge as he has had to determine the historical facts based upon the often mutually contradicting accounts of the conflicting parties. He manages the task very well: the events from the years 1581, 1588 and 1591 are reliably described as to the facts and meticulously analysed; the author strives to determine their origins and implications. The chapter moreover describes, very competently, the aforementioned disputes between the Evangelicals and the Jesuits. The author has not avoided the temptation to be seduced by the earlier authors, who quoted the data based on the Jesuit Society's exaggerated reports: he somewhat thoughtlessly informs us that the headcount of students in Wilno was apparently in excess of 700 in a number of years, peaking up to the improbable 1,210 (p. 110). Kempa uses the term 'schoolboy' (Pol.: *uczeń*) and 'student' (which refers in Polish to tertiary-level student) alternately, and hence most probably the inflated figure. I definitely understand the need to use synonymous terms in avoidance of unnecessary redundancies or for the sake of style; this, however, leads at times to serious instances of abuse. The researchers, from Ludwik Piechnik up to Tomasz Kempa himself, have mostly tended to confuse the two dissimilar institutions (and categories): the Jesuit College and St. John's School, the latter also run by the Society, both attended by schoolboys, and the Wilno Academy with its students. In fact, those attending lectures at the latter, having

sworn the oath to the Rector and completed the immatriculation procedure, were the only ones to enjoy the name of student and the privileges their status implied. The students formed a minority group among all the pupils educated by the Jesuits, whilst the latter most probably quoted an aggregated figure (to what extent the numbers of their wards might have been overstated cannot possibly be determined today).

Poland-Lithuania's second capital city had a similar situation: according to the estimates, the Liberal Arts, the largest of the faculties at the Cracow Academy, had some 300–350 students attending at a time.² It is therefore not quite plausible that the actual number of students (adding those in the elitist faculties of Theology, Medicine, and Law) could have ever exceeded 500. This comparison, again, shows that the data regarding the numerical force of Wilno 'students' are exaggerated and need being rectified. A (small) portion of criticism is also deserved by the descriptions and interpretations of the denominational tumults of the years 1581 and 1591. On p. 142, following the *Apologeticus*,³ the author tells us that the rioters "took away the Evangelical books from the libraries, and ordered for them to be burnt at where the traitor[s] were beheaded." The author concludes that the choice of the burning site was not coincidental and was meant to defile the religious opponents. This argument is not wrong, to my mind, and yet not completely right either. One might legitimately risk the hypothesis whereby a religious tumult is an act that consists in taking over the competencies of authority by the crowd at the moment the existing authority remains passive; in the context in question, passive in the face of the threat incited by the 'heretics'. Most of such events took place in broad daylight and in public. The victims or the movable properties belonging to the Evangelicals were oftentimes taken to the site of torment or the square in front of the town-halls; this, as I interpret it, in order to not only demonstrate how powerful the tumulters were, but also to exercise the competency of the official authority (often at the sites where acts of power were delivered) in punishing and disciplining the offenders by those locals who felt empowered to do so.

² Such is my own calculation, based on the immatriculation documents for the *Artes* faculty (in the peaking decade of the sixteenth century, 174 students per year were immatriculated) and the efficiency of earning the consecutive academic degrees. Cf. Henryk Barycz, *Historja Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w epoce humanizmu* (Kraków, 1935), 320; Irena Kaniewska, 'Młodzież Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego w latach 1510–1560. Studium statystyczne', in Kazimierz Lepszy (ed.), *Studia z dziejów młodzieży Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego w dobie Renesansu* (Kraków, 1964), 1–89.

³ *Apologeticus, to jest obrona konfederacyjnej. Przy tym seditio albo bunt kapłański na ewanieliki w Wilnie z wolej a łaski miłego Boga przed harpanem wynurzony* (Wilno, 1582), reed. Edmund Bursche (Biblioteka Pisarzy Polskich, 84; Kraków, 1932).

With respect to the proposed interpretation of the 1591 tumult, let me voice a minor objection, in the light of the sources the author has had access to. Albeit the records would not point out to the Jesuits as the perpetrators, Tomasz Kempa has been deceived, to some extent, by the notoriety associated with the Society of Jesus and thus ascribes to the Jesuits some contribution to the inspiration of the riot – though the way he expresses this opinion is rather inhibited.⁴ During my own query at the Wróblewski Library in Vilnius, I did come across a stapled document containing hitherto-unknown records related to this particular event, which dramatically alter the picture and clearly identify the actual perpetrators.⁵ These newly found documents remarkably broaden our knowledge on the context behind the burning of the Protestant church, as they comprise testimonies of witnesses from the investigation held at the Lithuanian Tribunal; subsequently follow the detailed legal actions of the injured Evangelicals against the accused students before the episcopal consistory. These testimonies clearly indicate the local Bernardine community as those who instigated the incineration. The discovery alters the image of the religious conflicts in Wilno, especially if the 1591 occurrences be considered together with the tumult of 1639, in which the Order of Friars Minor were evidently strongly engaged.

Chapter Four is on the Union of Brest, 1596, and the tumults that appeared in the late sixteenth century. These threads are followed up in the subsequent chapter which basically focuses on the disputes between the Uniates and the Orthodox Church members. Both these chapters offer what is the most interesting, and most valuable, about this book: as far as research into the history of political and social Orthodox and Uniate confessors, or the contacts between the ‘Greek’ world and the Catholics and/or Evangelicals, is concerned, Tomasz Kempa is an unchallenged authority – and the book under discussion confirms it once again.

Chapter Six describes the period 1610–32, when the Reformed Evangelical church was destroyed anew (in 1611); consequently, the archive of the Lithuanian Brethren (Pol.: *Jednota Litewska* – the Lithuanian Church’s provincial union) was fatefully damaged. The period in question marked a climax in the Uniate Church’s struggle against the Orthodox Fraternity of the Holy Spirit.

The next chapter describes the tempestuous years between the death of Sigismund III and the displacement of the Reformed church outside the ramparts of Wilno under the parliamentary verdict passed during the reign of said king’s successor (1632–40). The 1639 tumult, known to the earlier authors, with the resulting removal of the said church, is also covered. It might

⁴ “The occurrence must have owed something to the inspiration, be it indirect, from some of the Wilno Jesuits”, Kempa, *Konflikty wyznaniowe*, 171.

⁵ Vilnius, The Wróblewski Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences (*Lietuvos mokslų akademijos Vrublevskių biblioteka*), F40-1024.

be regretted, though, that the author missed the chance to reinterpret this so-well-documented happening in a cultural depiction.

Chapter Eight deals with a short though significant period in Wilno's history (whose importance is partly based on the religious relations) – the city's occupation by the Muscovite troops in 1655–62. This excellent section is largely based on foreign literature and the author's own research. The subsequent chapter describes the last of the periods covered, the latter half of the seventeenth century. The focus is, once again, on the conflicts between the Orthodox and the Uniate communities, as well as the last demolition of the Reformed Evangelical church (then already outside the city walls) in 1682. The author aptly appreciates the specificity of this particular tumult, which took place in unprecedented circumstances: the Calvinist community was significantly debilitated, if not defenceless; there was no actual reason behind the attack, whilst the rioters appeared ruthless more severely than ever before. These circumstances apparently won the Calvinists some sympathy from a part of the Catholic community, given the exacerbating Counter-Reformation trends (pp. 508–9).

The tenth (and penultimate) chapter describes the relations of the two non-Christian groups, namely the Jews and the Muslim Tatars, with the Christians, mainly of the Catholic denomination. As has already been said, this takes the author behind the main framework, superfluously perhaps. The section heavily draws on the older literature, rather than his own research, and thus does not much contribute to our knowledge of the subject-matter.

The last, eleventh, chapter is an attempt to glance at Wilno “as a phenomenon of multi-religious and multicultural urban hub”, meant to balance the negative picture of the local religious relations and conflicts, which has consistently been drawn throughout the monograph (in line with its lead theme). In my opinion, such an effort – and the chapter as such, indeed – is basically irrelevant. The author's choice of the research topic was not accidental; the relevant comments and remarks in respect of Wilno's multi-religious and multicultural character are encountered in the introductory section and scattered across the chapters. A conscious reader would be well aware that the history of Wilno is not that of confessional riots alone but the unrests were interspersed by periods of relative peace: after all, this message can be drawn from the monograph itself. Irrespective of the relevance of the section, it is clearly based for most part on the existing literature, mainly the studies of David Frick and the source edition he has compiled.

With a closer insight in the contents of the testaments analysed, a rather depressing image emerges as their authors (and recipients) mainly tended to enclose themselves within the confines of their own ethnicity or cultural circle (as a narrow concept), if not, merely, denomination. While some (however limited) social ties did appear between the Evangelicals and the Orthodox, no such contacts are attested for the Catholics and the Evangelicals – though

they did exist, as we can otherwise learn from the other sources. Judicial records, which are closer associated with the study's topic, have remained unused. These records reflect the whole spectrum of the burghers' responses to the religious violence (which coincides with the main line of the study), covering the broad array of actors and facts: from the inspiration of the riots through the active participation of the onlookers supporting either of the parties to the conflict, casual sneak-thieves taking advantage of the turmoil, up to the defenders of the confessional group under attack. This particular issue might have deserved a separate section, perhaps.

Having reviewed the monograph's content, a handful of particular comments can be attempted. The Introduction concludes with "some terminological remarks", where the author explains his understanding and use of the terms such as "(the) Reformation", "(the) Catholic reform", and "(the) Counter-Reformation", along with contradistinctions such as "(the) Orthodox Church vs. (the) Orthodox church", "(the) Church/(the/a) church/(the/a) Protestant church". However, the key notion of 'conflict' and its relative terms – 'tumult', 'riot(s)' or 'unrest(s)' remain unexplained. Kempa often tends to use these latter words in questionable contexts, not infrequently interchangeably with 'conflict'. With the semantic field of 'tumult' assumed in line with its Latin etymology,⁶ its application to the 1591 events should be named inappropriate (pp. 19, 171). Although the Reformed church in Wilno was destroyed for the first time then, it occurred out of a secret incineration perpetrated by unknown individuals. In turn, the occurrences from 1639 are correctly describable in terms of a 'tumult' (pp. 409 ff.): the church was not demolished then but mutual religiously motivated attacks continued for several days thereafter, leading almost to a regular battle as the Catholic crowd besieged the church in an attempt to destroy it. Such an evident violation of the routine of the town's life, where neither the castle-based nor the town-hall authorities prove capable of subduing the rioters can definitely be described as a 'tumult'.

Although this book is on Wilno, its author makes attempts to compare its various factors or aspects against the other towns within the Grand Duchy, as well as Cracow and L'viv; analysed in such terms is, for instance, the situation of a given religion or comparable confessional excesses. Not all of these excursions are successful since the author lacks at some points a deeper knowledge of the local context for the town he is referring to – just to name Cracow in this respect. For example, we can find (p. 169), with no reference to a source, that a tumult occurred in the course of the funeral of

⁶ According to a Latin-Polish dictionary for lawyers and historians (Janusz Sondel, *Słownik łacińsko-polski dla prawników i historyków* [Kraków, 1997], 960), *tumultus* stands for (i) noise; (iii) commotion, turmoil, upheaval; (iv) unrest; (v) agitation; (vi) riots, revolution; (viii) war.

a certain Regina Filipowska, and the Cathedral Chapter “expressed their regret and brought about the punishment of the perpetrators”. The undersigned is unaware of any such perpetrators (namely, students) having been punished; not to say, of the Chapter’s support in this respect. The Chapter’s members in fact responded to the protest lodged by the Evangelicals as follows: “c[a]eterum studiosos non esse in sua potestate neque iurisdictione, unde puniri eos non posse.”⁷ They naturally promised later on that in case any of those is found guilty of having participated in the riot, he shall be penalised as appropriate. The sincerity of this response can be doubted, though, since at the early stage of the Reformation movement in Cracow the local Evangelical community was mostly the more aggressive party; the Chapter records contain information on violent acts committed by the Evangelicals against the Catholic priests and the Cathedral itself in the years 1556–7, almost immediately preceding the aforementioned funeral tumult.

We come across another awkward statement on the following page, where we can read that “Five death sentences were passed and delivered on the causers of the tumult at that time [i.e. after the first demolition of the Cracow Protestant church in 1574].” The ‘causers’ were some individuals caught as they had with them low-value objects stolen from the church, or even picked up in the street. The point was that numerous valuables and private noble privileges disappeared from the church (the nobles as well-to-do burghers had amassed a great deal of wealth at that church (Pol.: *zbór*), which had a privilege from the king), whereas those sentenced individuals had taken off from the building some pieces of iron sheet-metal, which got sold afterwards for five grosz, three locks, or a Polish gallon (Pol.: *garniec*) of butter.⁸ They were, clearly, incidentally encountered persons who had just used the sudden opportunity, and by no means the violators. Those to blame was a gang of students who initiated the attack on the church and then protected the others who stormed and plundered it against the relief force from the castle and municipal offices. It was these students who reappeared as the perpetrators in a number of protestations, such as the one lodged by the deputy starost (Pol.: *podstarości*) of Cracow who came to the church’s aid but was repelled by the armed group of students. The *podstarości*’s testimony is credible: he certainly knew whom he fought. Those who might still doubt about the role of local Academy students and other members of the milieu will probably be finally convinced by the fact that not long after the tumult,

⁷ Roman Źelewski (ed.), *Materiały do dziejów reformacji w Krakowie. Zaburzenia wyznaniowe w latach 1551–1598* (Materiały Komisji Nauk Historycznych, 6; Wrocław, 1962), x, 12.

⁸ ‘Protokół badania i skazania pięciu uczestników zajęć za włamanie i kradzież’, in Waław Uruszczał, Anna Karabowicz and Maciej Mikuła (eds.), *Księga kryminalna miasta Krakowa z lat 1554–1625* (Kraków, 2013), 281.

the privilege of a certain Rafał Leszczyński, previously kept at the *zbór*, was found at the Collegium Maius.⁹ Nevertheless, none of the students was ever sentenced; most certainly, no capital punishment was executed. Thus, the fears shared by the local noblemen were confirmed; as they wrote to their 'brethren', the main violators ought to primarily be punished, "so that it may be imputed not for there after what they commonly say: *dat veniam corvulus, vexat censura columbas*, or: they hang the minor thief and bow to the great one."¹⁰

Yet, all these imprecise or awkward enunciations do not affect the main subject of the study; neither do they essentially alter the comprehensive image of the confessional relationships in Poland-Lithuania. In summing up, let me emphasise that since the monograph is a quite successful attempt at a comprehensive approach to the religious conflicts in the Commonwealth's Wilno, I have decided to mostly focus herein on its flaws or drawbacks (sparse as they are). This ought not to affect the overall image offered by the study under review. The book is well designed and thought-out – most evidently, a result of the many years of work and (re)search. Its unquestionable merit is that it deepens and helps (re)arrange the knowledge on confessional relationships in Wilno. To embrace and process such an extensive material, not infrequently based on contradicting accounts or testimonies, was a really demanding task – and Tomasz Kempa has skillfully met the challenge.

The disputes over competence when it came to judging the tumults are ably described. The precedent importance of the specific decisions is emphasised, and their impact on how the religious conflicts were further solved is indicated. The Wilno occurrences are shown in a broad context on the countrywide (i.e. Commonwealth) scale. The influences of the dietines (Pol.: *sejmiki*) and the parliament (Pol.: *sejm*) on the local denominational situation is described. Most of the arguments put forth by the author can easily be complied with; the others are inspiring enough to pose further research questions and increasingly daring hypotheses.

trans. Tristan Korecki

Dawid Machaj

⁹ Żelewski (ed.), *Materiały do dziejów reformacji*, 1, 42.

¹⁰ *Ibidem*, xlv, 36.

Robert Frost, *The Oxford History of Poland-Lithuania, i: The Making of the Polish-Lithuanian Union, 1385–1569*, Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York, 2015, 564 pp. + xxii, bibliog., index, maps, ill., table; series: Oxford History of Early Modern Europe

The first part of the two-volume *The Oxford History of Poland-Lithuania* penned by Scottish historian Robert Frost was published by the Oxford University Press in 2015, in a series on early modern history of European countries. Previously, the series published two-volume studies on the history of Ireland and the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, and a one-volume history of Denmark.¹ The study on Poland-Lithuania is subtitled *The Making of the Polish-Lithuanian Union*, which points to the way the topic dealt with should be comprehended. Rather than a textbook on the history of Poland-Lithuania, Frost focuses on the union that lasted four long centuries: from the marriage of Władysław II Jagiełło to Jadwiga of Anjou in 1385 till the Third Partition of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations in 1795. In European history, similar examples can only be traced for the British Isles – specifically, the 1707 Union between England and Scotland and the union established between Britain and Ireland in 1800. Apparently, the traits shared by the systems and political communities in the Isles and in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth have propelled the Scottish author to deal more closely with the Polish-Lithuanian union and its history.

Robert Frost has graduated from St. Andrews University and the University of London, submitting his PhD thesis at the latter under the tutelage of Norman Davies. He presently lectures at the University of Aberdeen; previously, he was associated for a dozen years with the London King's College. He has been dealing with the history of East Central and Northern Europe for more than thirty years now, publishing scholarly studies and popularising knowledge about these regions in Britain – with a particular focus on Poland and Lithuania. In contrast to his once-tutor Norman Davies, his focus as a research scholar is confined to the modern age.

The Making of the Polish-Lithuanian Union is a book on political and constitutional history. The first volume describes the origins of setting up a real union between the two countries. Importantly, it discusses the roots of the emerging association between the states at the height of the Middle Ages – the first years of the Jagiellon rule in Poland. Specifically for the history of Poland

¹ Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477–1806* (Oxford, 1998); Sean J. Connolly, *Contested Island, i: Ireland 1460–1630* (Oxford, 2007); ii: *Ireland 1630–1800* (Oxford, 2010); Joachim Whaley, *Germany and the Holy Roman Empire, i: Maximilian I to the Peace of Westphalia, 1493–1648* (Oxford, 2011); ii: *The Peace of Westphalia to the Dissolution of the Reich, 1648–1806* (Oxford, 2011).

and Lithuania, the temporal caesura is shifted more than a century backwards compared to the other publications of the series dealing with the modern history of European countries. This is an important decision indeed: one would not be in a position to understand the political system and the relationships between the 'Crown of the Kingdom of Poland' and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania without being aware of the occurrences of the period 1385–1569.

This monumental book consists of seven chapters. The first, entitled 'Towards union', discusses the genesis of the marriage between Jadwiga of Anjou and Jagiełło, and the terms-and-conditions of the union concluded at Kreva (Kreva). There is a subchapter 'On unions', presenting the notion of political union against a broader European background, with references to the historiography dealing not only with personal and dynastic unions but also federations, confederations and real unions. Reference to the classical arguments proposed by Georg Jellinek in the latter half of the nineteenth century (*Die Lehre von den Staatenverbindungen* [Berlin, 1882]) is of crucial importance there. The theoretical anchoring of the aforesaid issues in the state and law theory research can be helpful in undertaking comparative studies. As the author remarks, the historiography of the later Middle Ages and early modern time rarely touches upon the topic of union; when it does, it does so from the monarchical and dynastic standpoint. The fact is, though, that the history of political culture in modern Europe should constitute a separate research problem, beyond the historiography of individual countries or states.

Chapter Two, 'Establishing the union', describes the first decades of the functioning of the union, the shaping of institutions, granting of privileges or charters, and details the (reciprocal) policies pursued by Władysław Jagiełło and his cousin Vytautas Kęstutaitis. The structure of the Polish nobility (*szlachta*) is described as well, without however discussing its mediaeval origins in much detail.

The third chapter, 'Crisis', focuses on the second quarter of the fifteenth century, when 'separatist' sentiments intensified not only among the rulers but also among the noblemen of Lithuania and Rus'. The caesurae proposed for the period are 1422 and 1447. In respect of the latter date – marking the coronation of Casimir IV Jagiellon as King of Poland (he was, in parallel, Grand Duke of Lithuania since 1440) – the turn in the prevalent trends is convincingly demonstrated. The date at which the crisis apparently began, 1422 – referring to a peace treaty entered into at the Melno Lake by the Crown, the Grand Duchy and the State of the Teutonic Order – seems somewhat questionable.

The fourth chapter, entitled 'Consolidation and change', presents the history of the union under Casimir Jagiellon's reign and the conflict with the Teutonic Knights, concluded with the Second Peace Treaty of Toruń (Thorn) in 1466. Described are also the strivings of the Prussian elite and the importance of the Privilege of Nieszawa (1454). The final

subchapter in this section is a brief study on the status of peasantry and its influence on the type of economy that developed in the lands of Poland and Lithuania.

The subsequent two chapters – the fifth: ‘Dynasty and Citizenship’, and the sixth: ‘Reform’ – outline the policies of the Jagiellon monarchs in the region’s context and describe the institutional structure based on the parliamentary system. This part of the book offers a synthetic and very short description of the formation of the Sejm (‘From sejmiks to Sejm’) and an analysis of the ways in which the privileges from late-fifteenth century granted to the nobility informed the political system. Significantly, Chapters Four to Six attach special attention to the actions and endeavours of not only Polish nobles but also (if not, at times, primarily) those of Lithuania, Prussia, and Rus’. Finally, the last chapter – ‘Union accomplished’ – deals with the events of the last years before the real union was set up between the two countries. Analysis of the Lublin occurrences and of the very act of the 1569 union crowns the section.

The book has no introduction which would have described the method used by the author and the basic definitions related to history of law and political systems. Instead, these issues are exposed in the respective chapters which serve as peculiar commentaries to the historical events under discussion and the sources under analysis. Frost begins his considerations with the Union of Krevo and the origins of the dynastic union between the Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (consistently named ‘Poland’ and ‘Lithuania’ across the book) and ends with the achievements of the real union constructed in Lublin. He provides no final remarks in a separate summary, which might be due to the fact this is not the last volume yet. Admittedly, however, the structure of this book, which includes seven monumental parts without introductory or final remarks, where the argument is narrated in a manner characteristic of *histoire événementielle*, may make the reading quite demanding – especially to those who would be willing to treat this publication as an approachable synthetic compendium.

In consequence of the assumed perspective, which consists in reconstructing the history of the union, comes a very detailed analysis of the language and terms used in the historical sources, ones that have aroused controversies and diverse interpretations among the contemporaries as well as historiographers. Much attention is drawn to explanation of legal terms and notions which can become key to those readers who are unaware of the disputes involving the researchers exploring the history of Poland and Lithuania. There has definitely been no study of this kind available in the English-language literature before. Let us add that in Polish historiography, the last significant attempt at studying the topic in a broader fashion was made by Oskar Halecki, whose book on the history of the Jagiellonian union was published a hundred years ago (*Dzieje unii jagiellońskiej* [Kraków, 1919]).

In his reconstruction of the history of the Polish-Lithuanian union, Frost employs detailed analysis of the sources (the deeds of union, privileges/charters, chronicles) and builds thereupon his interpretations concerning the relationship between the countries and their elites. Emphasised is the role of external conflicts and the policies pursued by each of the rulers. The author has aptly assumed that the union he describes as an association of the two bodies politic was not merely a creation of the rulers but also the result of the citizens' strivings. The citizens were noblemen of, actually, several ethnicities; putting it otherwise, they represented several various nobilities. Consequently, the ethnicity- or nation-centred standpoint of the histories of the countries forming the union is overcome, the prevalent convictions concerning Polish imperialism and colonialism with respect to the eastern territories are broken, and – last but not least – the influence of non-Polish political elites on the shaping of the union is powerfully emphasised (with the resulting upset proportion between the way in which home affairs of Poland are approached, compared to those of Lithuania). Let us add at this point that Prussia and Rus' (Ruthenia), not mentioned in the title, are the background characters of this book.

As a result, the history of the Polish-Lithuanian union is shown in a way that can be described as multi-entity or multi-actor, its 'polyphonic' and polemical historiography being emphasised. Especially the latter aspect may appear of particular importance to the readers who, unaware of the findings of foreign historiographers, are accustomed to one – namely, national – interpretation of the union's history. The pluralism of historiographic opinions proposed by Frost is a remarkably strong point of his study, which will be treated primarily as a handbook on the history of Polish-Lithuanian union and a point of departure for further reading. A good example of the aspects in question is the discussion of how to understand the Latin verb *applicare* in the Krevo union deed (pp. 47 ff.), or the evaluation of the first years of Casimir IV Jagiellon's reign (p. 200). The book is symbolically dedicated to the four great historians who researched into the shared past of the Polish-Lithuanian union, taking various standpoints: Oskar Halecki of Poland, Adolfas Šapoka of Lithuania, Myxailo Hruševsky of Ukraine, and Matvej K. Ljubavskij of Russia.

As Frost announces (p. viii), the second (forthcoming) volume will deal with topics such as humanism and the Renaissance, religion (Reformation), and a most welcome study of cities/urban areas in Poland and Lithuania. Hence, we can expect that the book to come will refer back to the time before the Union of Lublin (1569). This may imply a broken chronological sequence (considering the content of the first volume), which might render the reading more difficult. Let us hope that the second part will describe the Commonwealth's political thought, which emerged in the modern age, as well as the intellectual culture which was important for the development of the idea of the union between the Two Nations and for the Reformation and Counter-

Reformation movements. The volume under review does not offer a separate study on these issues, and focuses instead on the history of the emerging union. The author has managed to switch from a national into a multinational (multiethnic) standpoint and to clearly explain the problems related to understanding and interpretation of the terms used in the relevant legal acts and privileges. Frost's considerations are an excellent example of traditional political history which, for the purpose of detailed analysis of the impact of events and processes on the shaping of a certain political reality, quits an expanded discussion of other related factors, such as soci(et)al/economic/cultural history. For a comprehensive appraisal of the work, though, one has to be acquainted with the forthcoming second volume.

trans. *Tristan Korecki*

Anna Pomierny-Wąsińska

Andreas Helmedach, Markus Koller, Konrad Petrovsky, and Stefan Rohdewald (eds.), *Das osmanische Europa. Methoden und Perspektiven der Frühneuezeitforschung zu Südosteuropa*, Eudora-Verlag, Leipzig, 2014, 506 pp., maps and ills.

This large volume consists of 19 articles grouped into four thematic chapters, and an introductory text coauthored by four editors, devoted to the state and perspectives of research focused on Ottoman Europe. The authors admit that the present-day concept of 'Ottoman Europe,' viewed as an integral part of the continent, has been born in the US and only later has entered Germany, yet at the same time they trace the roots of the notion back to nineteenth-century Weimar, where it was coined in 1820 by a German geographer, Georg Heinrich Hassel.

One major conceptual weakness of the book under review is that its editors have not decided either its geographic or chronological frames. Whereas on p. 423 we read that Ottoman Europe distinguished itself by its frontier character that made it different from the empire's other, especially Arab, provinces, the same volume contains an article on eighteenth-century artisans in Istanbul, so one wonders whether inhabitants of Istanbul also felt that they lived on the outskirts of the Ottoman Empire. Besides, one may observe that the term *serhadd*, used in reference to Ottoman Europe (p. 423), was equally valid and used by Ottoman authors in reference to Oran, Aden, or Lahsa that undoubtedly lay within the Arab provinces, and the exposure to foreign culture was probably felt stronger in Beirut, frequented by foreign 'Frankish' merchants, than in Felibe/Plovdiv or Kara Ferye/Veroia, situated within Ottoman Europe. Strangely enough, the volume also contains an article devoted to the adoption of Islam in the Golden Horde as seen by Central Asian and Crimean Tatar chroniclers. Although this highly interesting

study is undoubtedly one of the gems in the volume, one may still ask what persuaded the editors to include it in the present book as the link between its subject and Ottoman Europe has not been critically addressed.

The volume's chronology is another issue. The editors' introductory statement that early modern period lasted in Ottoman Europe till the early nineteenth century and was finally terminated by the Tanzimat reforms (p. 14) did not prevent them from including in the volume a text on nineteenth-century Varna that is focused on the post-Tanzimat period, or from discussing the introduction of clock towers as a sign of *Sozialdisziplinierung* (p. 414), which topic – albeit highly interesting – also belongs to the post-Tanzimat era.

Chapter One devoted to “rule, authority and violence” (‘Herrschaft – Macht – Gewalt’) begins with an overview of recent historiography penned by Andreas Helmedach and Markus Koller. The authors stress the departure from the once embedded view of Ottoman era as a tyrannical and alien rule by the Turks (*Fremdherrschaft der Türken*, p. 27), and describe the gradual incorporation of Ottoman studies into the global discussion on empire-making, fabrication of kingship, sacralization of power, and – last but not least – confessionalization, with frequent references to influential works by Peter Burke and Tijana Krstić. Dwelling on relevant literature, the authors also stress mutual benefits drawn by the Ottoman state and Orthodox church from their cooperation in the Balkans, and a high level of legitimacy enjoyed by the Ottoman dynasty in the eyes of its sixteenth- and seventeenth-century non-Muslim subjects. They also pose a highly relevant and provoking question, whether the Ottoman support for a Slav Orthodox patriarchate, reestablished in 1547 with the support of Mehmed Sokollu, should not be regarded as yet another element of confessionalization, in which the state supported a local church thus gaining in return its cooperation (pp. 39–41). Invoking the monograph by Baki Tezcan, devoted to socio-political transformation within the Ottoman Empire in the years 1580–1826¹, the authors observe that the following period brought a gradual loss of legitimacy, suffered by Ottoman sultans in the eyes of their Christian subjects, whose culmination was marked by Serbian and Greek insurrections, dated in 1804 and 1821, respectively. While interesting and provoking, this overview by Helmedach and Koller reveals yet another conceptual weakness of the volume under review. Based mostly on extant literature, the text provides a welcome introduction to general non-specialized readership, whereas it is of little use for Ottomanists who have been long familiar with the invoked authors and texts. This may suggest that the whole book is addressed to popular audience, yet this is

¹ Baki Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire. Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World* (Cambridge, 2010); cf. also my review article in *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, lxvi, 1 (2013), 117–25.

not the case, as most of other texts included in the volume are too specific and too detailed to satisfy a reader with generalist interests, who would like to familiarize them with the recent scholarship devoted to Ottoman Southeastern Europe. This internal inconsistency of the volume will be further addressed in my final remarks.

Chapter One also includes an article by Markus Koller who addresses various challenges to the Ottoman sultans' legitimacy caused by the lack of new conquests and military defeats suffered in the eighteenth century. At the same time, Koller observes that the empire's decentralization and the empowerment of provincial elites paradoxically contributed towards the state's very survival throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as these elites served as a clamp (*Klammer*) linking the centre and the peripheries. This thesis, which is not novel in Ottoman historiography, is stressed by the article's title: 'Vom Reich der Osmanen zum Osmanischen Reich'. The following article by Machiel Kiel and Hedda Reindl-Kiel addresses the ethno-religious changes in the district of Kalkandelen (Tetovo) in Ottoman Macedonia from the medieval era till 1900, including the highly politicized issues of the Islamization and 'Albanization' of the region. This little masterpiece shows how a meticulous microhistorical research, combined with a *longue durée* perspective, may help to solve macrohistorical questions in a balanced and unbiased way. The last two articles in Chapter One, penned by Norbert Spannenberger and Karl-Peter Krauss, focus on the colonization and settlement of Habsburg Hungary, mostly by Serbs and Germans, after its conquest from the Ottomans at the end of the seventeenth century. It is laudable that both authors try to bridge the Ottoman and Habsburg periods: for instance, Spannenberger observes that the region between Mohács and Szigetvár had been already colonized with Serbs by the Ottoman authorities in the years 1648–88 (p. 100), and Krauss admits that – contrary to contemporary Habsburg imperial propaganda – the newly acquired lands were in no way uninhabited ("keineswegs eine 'tabula rasa'", p. 134). The latter statement is hardly a new discovery for Ottomanist historians, but one is glad to see that at last it has also penetrated non-Ottomanist historiography. Still, on seeing the term *Befreiungskriege*, used by Spannenberger in reference to the Habsburg conquest of Hungary in the years 1683–99 (p. 105), in which thousands of Muslims, Jews, and Hungarian Protestants were slaughtered or expelled by the victors, one cannot help but sarcastically observe that political bias, of which Southeastern European historians are frequently accused, sits well within the German academia, too.

Chapter Two, devoted to economy ('Wirtschaft'), opens with a text on structures and institutions, penned by Markus Koller and Ralf C. Müller. The authors first recall the old discussions on Ottoman feudalism and the place of Ottoman Empire in global economy, and then examine the influence of new institutional economics and new cultural history, with their stress on institutions,

structures and networks, on present-day scholars who study the Ottoman economic past. Then follow four detailed case studies: on the continuity and discontinuity in pre-Ottoman and Ottoman mining in northern Macedonia (Mihailo S. Popović), on artisans in eighteenth-century Istanbul and their reactions to various opportunities and challenges (Suraiya Faroqhi), on the commercial activity of Ottoman non-Muslim subjects and their trade networks, extending to Western, Central, and Eastern Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Katerina Papakonstantinou), and on the port of Varna and its multiethnic population in the nineteenth century (Neriman Ersoy-Hacısalihoğlu). Interesting on their own, these articles would have certainly benefited if their subjects were less dispersed from each other and if the chapter were better structured, shaped by a common framework, common scholarly questionnaire and cross references. As it is now, it can be best summarized by a conclusion by Faroqhi that can be found at the end of her article, stressing a much larger agency and independence of Ottoman subjects versus the sultan's bureaucracy than it has been believed by scholars thirty or forty years ago (p. 217).

Chapter Three, devoted to religious cultures ('Religionskulturen'), begins with an introductory essay by Denise Klein and Stefan Rohdewald. The authors aim to replace the worn out notion of 'Ottoman tolerance' by addressing, in corresponding order, religious structures, practices, and discourses extant in the early modern Ottoman Empire. The term 'confessionalization', already used in reference to Ottoman realities in Chapter One, is also applied and discussed in Chapter Three. According to the authors, not only the Sunni clergy, belonging to the Hanafi school, benefited from the cooperation with the Ottoman state, but also the Orthodox patriarchate in Constantinople turned into a quasi *Landeskirche* in regard to Ottoman Orthodox Christians, and its zone of influence was substantially enlarged thanks to Ottoman conquests (p. 278). Similar cooperation can be witnessed between the Ottoman government and the Armenian and Jewish religious leaders, although the authors distinguish early modern realities from the nineteenth-century ones and are aware of anachronisms that once distorted our view of the so-called *millet* system (p. 276).² Drawing on rich literature, to mention only the works by Rossitsa Gradeva, Molly Green, Kaspar von Greyerz, Marlene Kurz, Gerhard Podskalsky, and Mihailo Popović, the authors also trace alternative phenomena and trends that ran parallel with confessionalization, namely flexible religious identities and interconfessionalism, embodied by such prominent personalities as Mara Branković – the wife of Sultan Murad II, the 'Calvinist patriarch' Kirillos Loukaris, as well as thousands of inhabitants of Ottoman Europe whose names have not been recorded. Of special interest is a remark, comparing reactions of Orthodox hierarchs to the

² On the *millet* system, see also the article by Eleni Gara in the present issue.

challenges of Catholic Counterreformation in Poland-Lithuania and the Ottoman Empire (p. 304).³ The authors also touch upon an under-researched topic, namely religious skepticism and indifference. This last issue is further addressed in the following article by Tobias P. Graf, being a case study devoted to the person of Ladislaus Mörth, a Christian renegade who deserted from the Habsburg embassy in Istanbul in 1593 and entered Ottoman service. The following article by Stefan Rohdewald relates the transfers of relics of Orthodox saints between various religious centres and the ways of their remembering in different regions of Southeastern Europe. For instance, after the Ottoman conquest of the Bulgarian Kingdom, the remains of the Greek saint Paraskeva (Petka) were transferred in 1396 from Târnovo to Serbia. After the fall of Belgrade to Sultan Suleyman these relics traveled to Constantinople, and in 1641 they were successfully claimed by the hospodar of Moldavia and arrived at Jassy. Hence for a time this saint could have been claimed by the Greek, the Bulgarian, the Serbian, and the Moldavian/Romanian Orthodox churches and accordingly remembered (p. 344). In analogy, the Rila monastery shifted its allegiance between Ohrid, Târnovo and Peć, and its holy saint Ivan Rilski could be alternatively claimed by Greek, Bulgarian and Serbian hierarchs and – later on – historiographies, while both Petka and Ivan were also venerated in Montenegrin Cetinje. Rohdewald refers to such shifts and shared cults as trans-church (*transkirchlich*) or trans-ethnic (*transethnisch*), in opposition to trans-confessional and trans-religious ones that have so far received more scholarly attention. To be sure, the latter phenomena also existed in Southeastern Europe, to mention only the cult of St. Petka that also extended to Catholic regions, the popular cult of Sarı Saltuk shared by the local Muslims and Christians, or the veneration of St. Naum of Ohrid among Albanian Bektashis. Also in this case, the author invokes a parallel with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the eastern provinces of the Polish Crown, where shared cults could be observed among Roman Catholics, Uniates and Orthodox Christians (p. 362). The fourth article in Chapter Three, penned by Ioannis Zelepos, discusses ambivalent attitudes of the Orthodox church towards the belief in vampires, which was assumed to be notorious in Southeastern Europe. The fifth article by Denise Klein, already mentioned above, compares narrations on the conversion to Islam of two khans of the Golden Horde, Berke (r. 1257–67) and Özbek (1313–41), composed by a sixteenth-century Central Asian chronicler Ötemiş Hacı, and an eighteenth-century Crimean Tatar chronicler ‘Abd al-Gaffar Kırımı. Klein persuasively demonstrates how shamanistic and folk elements, still present in the earlier version, were edited

³ Cf. an article by Tomasz Kempa on a “Polish-Lithuanian episode” in Loukaris’s life, in *idem*, ‘Kyrillos Loukaris and the confessional problems in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth at the turn of the seventeenth century’, *Acta Poloniae Historica*, 104 (2011), 103–28.

out from the later one, whose author paid attention that his story conform with orthodox Islam. Still, neither the author nor the editors have explained the reason why this highly interesting text has been included in a volume focused on Ottoman Europe.

Chapter Four, devoted to perception of time and historical interpretations ('Zeitwahrnehmung – Geschichtsdeutungen'), is perhaps the most original in the book. It opens with a collective text by Dennis Dierks, Konrad Petrovsky and Nikolas Pissis, announcing possible research fields, from different concepts of time and religiously motivated time-systems, to individual perceptions of time. In a following article, Konrad Petrovsky asks rhetorically whether there existed a historiography of the Ottoman Empire, written by Ottoman Christian subjects, and provides a typology of various literary genres: from traditional narratives that situated the Ottoman state within the divine plan of creation and salvation, to chronicles listing merely the names of successive sultans and sometimes provided with their portraits, to genuine historiographic works, whose authors aimed at explaining the causes of political changes. Although the author agrees that the last genre was born only in the eighteenth century, and the chronicle by Dimitrie Cantemir has been justly regarded as a milestone, he nonetheless observes that Cantemir was not alone. Moreover, not all contemporary Christian authors, who discussed the Ottoman history, shared Cantemir's persuasion and hope that the empire was destined to fall, and some of them remained loyal to the sultan. The following article by Nikolas Pissis focuses on apocalyptic views contained in the texts of Greek authors who were active in the Ottoman era. The author provides an interesting link between these early modern views and more recent phenomena, traditionally associated with eighteenth- and nineteenth-century modernization processes, such as the "fixation on Russia as a liberator" and the Greek nationalism, including the *Megali Idea* (p. 483). In the author's view, these seemingly distant ideas, put into life by local elite members as well as the agents of Venice, Spain and Russia, aimed at awakening the subversive potential that was rooted in the plebeian mind (p. 484). The closing article by Gülçin Tunali examines a unique work by Mahmud Efendi, an Ottoman mufti from Athens, who in the early eighteenth century composed a history of Athens that was focused on its ancient past and recalled the names of its philosophers and mythological heroes, including Theseus. Observing that the Greek and Byzantine past played a larger role in the self-perception of Ottoman elites than it has been admitted in the Turkish nationalist historiography of the early Republican era, the author nonetheless concedes that his observation is less valid in regard to Greek mythology, and the work by Mahmud Efendi did not exert much influence on his contemporaries. It is only during the Tanzimat era, when the interest in Hellenism arose among the Ottoman elite members, who began to create a 'cultural memory' of the ancient past, including the Greek past and Greek mythology.

To resume, the book under review contains many interesting articles that bring new vistas on the past of 'Ottoman Europe' and reexamine mutual relations between its Muslim and non-Muslim (especially Orthodox Christian) inhabitants. Yet this book's main flaw is its incoherence and the lack of correspondence between its different parts. Especially the first two chapters, devoted to *Herrschaft* and *Wirtschaft*, respectively, contain articles that rarely communicate with each other, no common questions are addressed by their authors and there are hardly any cross-references, not to mention common conclusions. Some of the articles, especially on demographic changes in Macedonia and on the artisans in eighteenth-century Istanbul, may have equally well been placed in another chapter, devoted to *Gesellschaft*, that is missing in the volume. Several articles are devoted neither to *Frühneuzeit*, nor to *Südosteuropa*, and the criteria of their inclusion in the volume are not explained. The fact that this book has as many as four editors further adds to blurring their responsibility. Apart from a rather short general introduction, hardly any efforts are visible to provide the book with a more consistent shape. The volume has no conclusion, no index, no information about the authors is provided. In short, this is a textbook example how a scholarly collective volume should *not* be edited. Although the volume contains a number of valuable studies and its last two chapters are slightly more coherent, these studies would have probably fared better and gained a larger audience in a scholarly journal or a better-focused collective volume. A partial explanation why such a sloppy edition has come to light is provided by an attached information that it has resulted from a project financed by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*. Sadly, in our times it happens more and more often that half-digested volumes are hastily published in order to satisfy the formal requirements of the grant-givers.

In seventeenth-century Poland, a popular literary genre was the so-called *silva rerum*, literally a "forest of things" whose compiler recorded any event that he deemed worth remembering; hence we find side by side news on a naval battle in the Mediterranean, a civil war in England, and a birth of a three-headed piglet in rural Mazovia. Today, such collections are valued by scholars studying the mental world of early modern Polish nobles, despite their somewhat chaotic internal making. Perhaps the book under review, despite its shortcomings that have been addressed above, will likewise serve future generations of historians as an illustration of realities that conditioned the academic life of early twenty-first-century Europe.

Dariusz Kołodziejczyk

Teofilia Mahler, *Walka między ortodoksją a postępowcami w Krakowie w latach 1843–1868. (Komitet Starozakonných a Wydział dla Spraw Żydowskich)* [The Struggle between Orthodox and Progressive Jews in Cracow between 1843 and 1868], Austeria, Kraków and Budapeszt, 2017, 208 pp.; series: *Studia i materiały z dziejów judaizmu w Polsce*, 3

Teofilia Mahler's master's thesis, *Walka między ortodoksją a postępowcami w Krakowie w latach 1843–1868* (further referred to as *The Struggle*) was defended in 1934 and written under the supervision of Majer Bałaban, a renowned historian and founder of modern Jewish historiography in Poland. Before the outbreak of the Second World War, an Association of Majer Bałaban's Students announced a list of works to be published in a second volume of a Jubilee Book marking the anniversary of Bałaban's professional activity. The book was not published however due to the outbreak of the war. As a result, *The Struggle* appeared only recently as a third volume of the series *Studia i materiały z dziejów judaizmu w Polsce* [Studies and source materials from the history of Judaism in Poland]. It is deserving of publication for a number of reasons; first and foremost because the pre-war dissertation by Mahler is partly based on sources that did not survive the war, yielding access to their lost content. Secondly, it is one of the most comprehensive studies on Progressive Jews in Cracow, and on the Polish lands in general.

Mahler's work is comprised of four chapters in which she (a Cracow native who graduated from the University of Warsaw Faculty of History) attempts to reconstruct the dispute between Orthodox and Progressive Jews in Cracow from 1843 up until 1868; or to be more precise, between the institutions of both parties, namely the Jewish Committee (Pol.: *Komitet Starozakonných*) and the Israelite Department (Pol.: *Wydział ds Izraelickich*), the latter of which was established in 1866 by the Cracow City Council.

In the first chapter ['The establishment of the Jewish Committee'] the author describes the history of the Committee, which was established in 1817 in place of the fully autonomous *kahal*. Deprived of many of its former prerogatives, it became a sort of advisory council and a representative body of the Jewish community, first under the supervision of the Senate, then under the Administrative Council, Commission of the Governorate, and finally – the Magistrate.

In the second chapter ['The beginning of struggle between Orthodoxy and the Progressives'], Mahler presents the origins of Cracow's Progressive circle. Its leaders founded the Association of Religion and Civilization (Pol.: *Stowarzyszenie Religijno-Cywilizacyjne*), "in need of strong support against its greatest enemy" (i.e. Orthodoxy, p. 78). According to Mahler the basic goal of the Association was the moral and economic elevation of Jews, with the aim

of gaining freedom from – as she puts it – the yoke of Orthodoxy, and above all the Association aimed at the proper education of children, including in secondary schools. Though she describes the Association as “drawing examples from the civilized Jews abroad” she does not specify which countries she was referring to. We may assume that she had in mind the biggest centres of the Habsburg monarchy – Vienna and Prague – especially given that later in her dissertation she finds an affinity between Cracow’s Progressives and Adolf Jelinek, the preacher of a Progressive synagogue in Vienna and one of the most notable religious leaders in the Monarchy and a supporter of the so-called moderate reform of Judaism. While investigating the origins of the conflict, she claims that according to the Orthodox Jews the new community would only “bring about the annihilation of Jewry” (p. 71). Later, she discusses the first signs of the conflict – a quarrel between rabbi Dow Ber Meisels and Jozue Fink, a member of the Progressive movement (pp. 83–89).

In the third chapter [‘The Israelite Department and its fight against the Committee’] Mahler discusses the establishment of the City Council Department for Jewish Affairs and its conflict with the Jewish Committee. Its establishment was linked to the fact that in 1866 a *Temporary Communal Statute for the city of Cracow* was issued, guaranteeing autonomy to the city. According to the Statute the city was to be represented by the City Council, which also included Jews. It was then that the Department was first established, as an auxiliary institution that dealt with the particular problems of Jews. Since the Department was considered to be the only official representative body of the Jewish population, the Jewish Committee (with its Orthodox majority) was deprived of its prerogatives and the conflict became inevitable. The final chapter of Mahler’s work focuses on this conflict.

According to Mahler the conflict reached its peak in 1868 with the dispute between rabbi Szymon Schreiber and Szymon Dankowicz, the preacher of the progressive Tempel synagogue built a few years earlier. Mahler reconstructs this dispute in the fourth chapter, which for a long time (along with the entry on Dankowicz written by Bałaban in the *Polish Biographical Dictionary* and his short study on Jews of Cracow) was the only source of information on Dankowicz – the first Jewish preacher in Cracow who preached in Polish. Mahler investigates not only the dispute in which he took part but also his pro-Polish activities, but unfortunately stops prematurely in 1868 and admits she did not manage to establish what happened later with respect to the dispute nor Dankowicz’s subsequent role in Cracow. These issues were only recently dealt with by Alicja Maślak-Maciejewska – 80 years after Mahler’s dissertation.¹

¹ See: Alicja Maślak-Maciejewska, ‘Działalność Szymona Dankowicza w Krakowie (1867–1875)’, in Michał Galas (ed.), *Synagoga Tempel i środowisko krakowskich Żydów postępowych* (Studia i materiały z dziejów judaizmu w Polsce, 1; Kraków and Budapest, 2012); *eadem*, ‘Rabin Szymon Dankowicz (1834–1910) – życie i działalność’ (Studia

Despite many deficiencies in Mahler's work, the decision to publish it today must be met with approval. I agree with the argument that the text can have a dual significance for the reader, as a "a useful study of a certain historical problem and at the same time ... an important source when it comes to history of Jewish historiography itself" (p. 25). As already mentioned, Mahler's work is partly based on sources that did not survive the war, as well as on sources that did survive it, but have not been used since the war due to changed call numbers. The author of this critical edition – *Studia i materiały z dziejów judaizmu w Polsce*, 3 managed to rediscover these latter works.

The edition follows the editorial principles for twentieth-century sources, including in part the *Projekt instrukcji wydawniczej dla źródeł historycznych XIX i początku XX w.* [Project of editorial instructions for nineteenth and twentieth-century sources] by Ireneusz Ilnatowicz, as well as newer presented instructions by Janusz Tandecki and Krzysztof Kopiński, and finally the practical solutions used by Paweł Fijałkowski in his edition of a dissertation written by another of Bałaban's disciples, Dwojra Raskin. Due to the numerous challenges inherent in Mahler's text (two kinds of annotations, wrong references, factual mistakes) and other circumstances (reorganization of archives, changes of call numbers, and the location of documents) the work of Maślak-Maciejewska can only be described as an impressive complement to Mahler's work. She has added the page numbers of cited studies, amended wrong references and factual mistakes, established the location of the majority of sources (and added present-day signatures), and sorted out the spelling of names and orthography. When evaluating Mahler's monograph one has to take into account that the author could not base her work on any previous publications and therefore had to rely only on archival sources. Bałaban's work on the progressive movement (mainly in Lwów's Tempel) was published a few years later.² In this respect, *The Struggle* is pioneering work, even if it was written under Bałaban's supervision.

Nevertheless, one has to mention some deficiencies. First of all, Mahler focuses on the formal aspects of the dispute, as if it was only a matter of the prerogatives of both institutions. Mahler creates a 'narrative of conflict' (to use a term proposed by Maślak-Maciejewska) and applies it to the institutional level. The ideological, religious, social (and class) aspects are almost untouched. Her work therefore produces a picture that is not nuanced enough –

i materiały z dziejów judaizmu w Polsce, 2; Kraków and Budapest, 2013); *eadem*, 'The Activity of Szymon Dankowicz, the Chief Rabbi of Bulgaria (1889–1891), in the Light of the Sources Produced within the Circles of the Alliance Israelite Universelle', *Scripta Judaica Cracoviensia*, xi (2013), 97–106; *eadem*, 'Progressive Preacher Szymon Dankowicz (1834–1910). A study in the History of Progressive Judaism in Partitioned Polish Lands', *Scripta Judaica Cracoviensia*, xiv (2016), 69–84.

² Majer Bałaban, *Historia lwowskiej Synagogi Postępowej* (Lwów, 1937).

we do not learn about the various and complicated tensions inside the Jewish community. The author pictures both groups in a very essentialist manner, so that they look rather schematic.

The works of Mahler, and especially Bałaban, for a very long time shaped the way historians thought of the mutual relations between the Orthodox and the Progressives. Today's research requires a new approach and new terms ('social class' for instance). New perspectives could produce a new and more nuanced interpretation of these relations, as well as the very genesis and development of the Progressive movement. The question we need to ask today is how and to what degree these institutions (for instance, The Association of Religion and Civilization) interacted with social hierarchies based on class and the possession of cultural capital?³

proofreading James Hartzell

Paweł Jasnowski

Balázs Trencsényi, Maciej Janowski, Mónika Baár, Maria Falina, and Michal Kopeček, *A History of Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe, i: Negotiating Modernity in the 'Long Nineteenth Century'*, Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York, 2016, 687 pp., bibliog., index

Being the first so ambitious attempt at describing the political thought of the area spanning from Estonia to Bulgaria and from Ukraine to Czech Republic, this book is impressive not only in its size (another volume is forthcoming!). The broad glance of the diverse subject-matters tackled, the consistent application of a comparative perspective, and the homogeneous, pleasantly readable style (a real rarity for a multi-author publication) are admirable. The five authors originally intended to write "a genuinely transnational intellectual history" (p. 1), one that would reinstate East Central Europe's desired place in the history of political thought; a book that would be free from discursive autarky, as otherwise typical for local scientific traditions. There is no doubt that the design has been delivered successfully: this extremely rich and competent compendium will certainly be an indispensable companion of researchers specialising in local (and, hopefully, not only local) intellectual traditions.

The volume is comprised of a short introduction and four extensive parts covering the great ideological formations: the Enlightenment, the Romanticism, the Modernism, and the crisis of Modernism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. These sections are divided into numbered chapters (three to

³ See also Moshe Rosman, *How Jewish is Jewish History?* (Oxford and Portland, OR, 2007).

five in each), consisting of shorter subchapters. None of the smaller or larger sections of which the book is built is limited to a single country or nation. The story unceasingly leaps from one place to the other, rarely staying in one country for longer than several paragraphs. The authors follow the ideas being presented, based on the apt assumption that nations inhabiting a region and wrestling with similar problems have to do with, broadly speaking, similar ideas. Such an approach brings, at times (better to say, almost everywhere), astonishing comparisons or juxtapositions; certain phenomena appear in a different than usual context. Comparative concepts of ‘national revivals’ in the former half of the nineteenth century, or the formation of modern political movements, are more common to the earlier literature (both threads, though in a more restricted geographical reach, are covered, for instance, in a popular book by the Polish historian Henryk Wereszycki entitled *Pod berłem Habsburgów*¹). The reader accustomed to one of the local canons of the history of political thought will find much more astonishing the proposed broad and inclusive definition of the late Enlightenment age – a concept that logically complements the stance recently expressed by one of the authors in the trilogy on the history of Polish intelligentsia.²

An important factor that revises the comparative pattern is the timeframe of individual intellectual formations that differed by country and culture. The fundamental assumption behind the book is that the political thought developed diachronically in the region concerned. While the ideological formations tended to occur there usually in a similar sequence, the time intervals were longer or shorter: Hungary would have always preceded Albania, to cut the long story short. The authors recognise this fact and adapt their storytelling method to it, by quitting the classical chronological order, among other things. Such a way of (re)arranging the enormous material is legitimate and does yield the expected effects, facilitating the understanding of ideas and attitudes of the political actors being described. At some rare moments does it turn into a somewhat irritating manner, as if the authors expected that every single essential and repeatable political phenomenon has to have a counterpart in every (at least, in every larger) country. Such is the case, for instance, with the description of the historiographic output of Myxailo Hruševsky. As we can read, “in the absence of a normative Romantic synthesis of Ukrainian history”, Hruševsky “could not play the role of the critic of Romantic myths.

¹ Henryk Wereszycki, *Pod berłem Habsburgów. Zagadnienia narodowościowe* (Kraków, 1975).

² Jerzy Jedlicki (ed.), *Dzieje inteligencji polskiej do roku 1918*, i: Maciej Janowski, *Narodziny inteligencji 1750–1831* (Warszawa, 2009); English version: Jerzy Jedlicki (ed.), *A History of the Polish Intelligentsia*, Pt. 1: Maciej Janowski, *Birth of the Intelligentsia*, trans. Tristan Korecki (Geschichte – Erinnerung – Politik. Studies in History, Memory and Politics; Frankfurt am Main et al., 2014).

He thus had to find a way to fill the gap and in a way serve as a Romantic and a positivist historian at the same time” (p. 565). Although the comparative concept allows to point out to certain potential options Hruševsky and the other characters actually faced, the causality is undeterminable with its use. Hruševsky did not have to do a thing. On the other hand, to nit-pick on those scarce moments where the charm of comparative approach seems to have overly taken charge of the authors would not be a fair thing to do. Owing to the assumed interpretative pattern, they quite often succeed to spotlight a number of interesting and original thinkers who have been somewhat forgotten in their respective national contexts – one of them being Stanisław Herbert-Heybowicz, the outstanding Polish theorist of the national question. Thus, the assumed method passes, in most cases, its practical test.

This is mostly owed to the authors’ liberal approach towards the methodological issues. The book opens with a declaration identifying the *Begriffsgeschichte*, in Reinhart Koselleck’s concept, coupled with a contextual history (J.G.A. Pocock), as its inspiration. Yet, its influence on the reader is not too manifest; it is certainly not burdensome, in any case. Attention is potentially drawn, at most, by a few reappearing borrowed phrases, ‘horizon of expectations’ being one of them. The author’s interest in the functioning of language, as declared in the introductory remarks, impresses no clear stamp on the narrative style applied. Consequently, this book will not revolutionise the methodology of research into the history of ideas. Its actual importance consists in filling the gaps in the history of European political thought, and in providing a counterpoint to the individual national historiographic schools. The rather classical way in which the story in question is told does facilitate its reception. Such a conservative approach helps the reader deal with the enormous material gathered in the volume.

While the narrative style is not quite innovative, the organisation of work on this ambitious project serves as a rare example of successful collective work, with the resulting book that is probably of a much higher quality than a hypothetical work that would have potentially been written on the subject by any of the five authors on his/her own. Whoever has come across one of those ‘collective monographs’ offered by the historiographies of Central Eastern and Southeast Europe, will observe with appreciation that even in a careful reading the seams linking the sections written by various authors are not conspicuous at all. It must have called for enormous effort to achieve such a result. As I have mentioned, the narrative never stops, even for a while, at one place. The combination of individual fragments has not been carried out mechanically by a ‘super-editor’ but must have resulted from multilateral negotiation. As we can learn from the introduction, the authors moreover took advantage of a dozen expert scholars who enabled them to follow not only the larger and better known traditions of political thought but to include those peripheral ones, Estonian among them (Kaarel Piirimäe’s remarks provided

the indispensable material). Given such an excellent insight in the subject-matter as well as in the historian milieu of East Central and Southeast Europe, it seems even more astonishing that the authors have not managed to include Greece. As they remark, this gap ought to be approached as a rather essential testimony to the region's 'mental maps', which sometimes have not much to do with the country's geographic location or actual neighbourhood.

It would take more space than is appropriate for a review to summarise a work so immense, whose character is that of a handbook. It is worth, however, to pose a question that accompanies the reader (almost) throughout the book: What is it that is peculiar to this particular region of Europe? Does East Central Europe really form an entity, or, is the proposed list of the countries under analysis merely a matter of geographical coincidence? Apart from a general answer, the book provides a series of detailed indications. The former consists of the references to modernisation, underdevelopment, and transfer of ideas, scattered across the study. East Central and Southeast Europe accepted and absorbed, as a rule, the ideas produced in the West: there is no dissenting opinion among the authors on this point. They moreover remind us that among these imports was the idea to finally quit the imitative attitude and oppose it with the region's own, purportedly organic, tradition. As repeatedly emphasised by Jerzy Jedlicki, one of the intellectual patrons of the study under review, the borrowings from the West were drawn by both sides: the *Zapadniks* and the Slavophiles. The comparative perspective allows the authors to more deeply (re)consider the mechanisms of the transfers in question, their non-simultaneity and non-evidence, which is due to the difference in the contexts in which the ideas were meant to function. Even if the regional political thought fed on imported goods, the use it tended to make of them remained its own business. Such an understanding of the ideological transfers has enabled to identify original aspects where the more traditional concepts could not spot them: namely, in the ways in which the borrowed ideas were adopted to the local determinants, unrestrainedly blended and processed.

The book moreover points to certain trends in political thought which developed most successfully in this particular part of Europe. There are four such currents coming to the fore, which marked their presence the most strongly at the end of the nineteenth century. One of them was agrarian populism. In the region that struggled with chronic deficiency of capital and thus with weak cities, this political orientation gathered steam due to the objective reasons (as it represented peasantry, the largest social class) and to the dogmatic attitude of the local social democrats. While the socialists, loyal to the theses of Marx, expected the working class to become dominant, politically and number-wise, the populists took over the field and offered their voters eclectic agenda blends that adopted anticlericalism and criticism of liberalism, nationalism and, not infrequently, anti-Semitism combined

with elements of socialism. Several outstanding political leaders emerged out of such a formation – to name Stjepan Radić or Aleksandar Stambolijski. Analogous local conditions fostered the development of federative ideas. These were contributed by liberals and socialists (especially, Balkan ones), by Jewish folkists and even by conservatives, such as Aurel Popovici. Another current in the political thought which in East Central Europe played a generally larger role than in the western part of the continent, was civic radicalism. A cohort of courageous intellectuals at the turn of the century, driven by a personal sense of morality and dissent against their contemporary standards of functioning of political parties, formulated several versions of a programme for ‘non-political politics’. The most influential among those figures was definitely Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, the first president of independent Czechoslovakia. Oszkár Jászi also pursued a (short-lived) political career. The other civic radicals were mostly influential in the sphere of ideas rather than in political pragmatics – the notorious examples being Edward Abramowski, Stanisław Brzozowski, or Jan Baudouin de Courtenay. Finally, anarchism and anarcho-syndicalism was, in the authors’ opinion, probably the most astonishing trend in the political thought that ripened faster and more abundantly in the east rather than west of Europe. Although always marginal compared to the other ideologies, the trend did enjoy a long duration. The ideas of civil disobedience and left-liberal resistance to authoritarian regimes were subsequently repeatedly revived across the region: in the 1930s and in the Stalinist period; in the dissident movement from the 1970s onwards. Presently, they are perhaps followed up in countries like Hungary and Poland.

In order to learn how original in the general European context these particular traditions of political thought are, a comparative exercise had to be employed. Another benefit of such a depiction of the topic is that all the manifestations of the transfer of ideas between the nations of East Central Europe have been highlighted, excluding the West European ‘centre’. The local traditions of the history of ideas and, more generally, the history of culture, tend to place an emphasis on the direct relations between the local thinkers, authors or artists with their Western counterpart ‘originators’. The study under discussion blatantly shows that some personal and intellectual connections and interrelations between the peripheries of European thought proved to be more important than the apparent analogies. Myxailo Drahomanov’s influence on the Bulgarian Left is explained in these terms: not only his sympathy for the oppressed common people but also family ties were fundamental to his association with the option (pp. 524–5). Another, much more important example of ideologies emerging under the influence of local thinkers and local conditions, is certain trends in the Jewish political thought, which is covered at considerable length in the study.

A History of Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe is worth of utmost appraisal owing to the skilful depiction of an extensive richness

of political thought developing over more than a hundred years in the region, as a coherent and logical whole. Is the proposed argument free of flaws or controversial theses? Most probably, not; experts in the specified segments of political thought will expectedly find there fragments to object or causing a feeling of insufficiency. The undersigned would, for instance, put more emphasis on the practical political and charity activities of the women's organisations in the years 1914–18 as the founding argument for the postulates of political emancipation of women put forth in the late years of the Great War and the beginnings of the interwar period. To give another example: Juozas Gabrys-Paršaitis described as a leading Lithuanian politician in the early twentieth century, with the 'business' nature of his activities and his connections with the French and, subsequently, German intelligence service being neglected, attests to a rather random knowledge of the recent literature on this otherwise extremely interesting figure.³ None of these remarks, however, relates to a gross omission or error and they nowise inform the general appraisal of the book being reviewed. Any self-respecting scholar specialising in the history of East Central or Southeast Europe should get acquainted with this study, or at least have it accessible as a reference source.

trans. *Tristan Korecki*

Maciej Górny

Erika Quinn, *Franz Liszt. A Story of Central European Subjectivity*, Brill, Leiden, 2014, 276 pp.; series: Studies in Central European Histories, 59

Erika Quinn has proposed a biographical story on the composer Franz (Ferenc) Liszt, presenting (mostly) the facts of his life (and, partly, creative output) against a broad background of cultural history. Viewed from a different perspective, the story is about certain important phenomena in nineteenth-century artistic culture, illustrated by the exemplary biography of a composer and virtuoso. Central to the conceptual apparatus employed for the purpose is the category of *subjectivity*, which reappears (at times, excessively) throughout the story. As we are told in the introduction, the term is intended to replace the notion of identity which, in the author's opinion, associates with something durable, fixed once and forever, whereas subjectivity is changeable, fluid, indeterminate, and dependent on a variety of contexts. Hence, the book traces various subjectivities of Liszt, which defined his self-identification in the different periods of his life. As Quinn quite aptly remarks in the conclusive

³ See Juozas Gabrys, *Auf Wache für die Nation. Erinnerungen. Der Weltkriegsagent Juozas Gabrys berichtet (1911–1918)*, ed. by Eberhard Demm, Christina Nikolajew, and Nathalie Chamba (Frankfurt am Main, 2013).

summary, since no individual has infinite options to choose from, the choices he or she individually opts for can tell us something about the cultural and historical context in which they have been made (p. 247). This mutual dependence, or interdependence, between the period and individuality is reliably discussed in the study, to the advance of the latter.

There are six chapters, each telling a story of one age in the life of Liszt – and, of one of his respective (assumed) subjectivities. Chapter One, having briefed us on the childhood years of the central character, focuses on Liszt's virtuoso career in Paris, with the related facets of his success: artistic and social, love affairs included. It also deals with musical virtuosity as a phenomenon specific to social reception of music in the Romanticist period. The second chapter recounts what happened in the 1840s: the time Liszt found – or rather, chose – the Hungarian identity for himself and became a convinced Hungarian patriot. The third chapter presents Liszt's activities in Weimar in the latter half of the 1840s and in the 1850s. Liszt was attracted by the peculiar cultural ambience of Weimar, which prevailed there since Goethe's time. The local princes had the ambition to earn their merits as patrons of arts, whereas Liszt's ardently sought to transform the German music: thus, a field for action opened before both parties. Quinn enters a polemic with those scholars who interpret the German bourgeois culture as a manifestation of escapism – a refuge for the educated strata from politics in a time that, following the defeat of the Spring of Nations, did not favour liberalism. Some of these scholars, advocating the argument of a German *Sonderweg* – 'special path', believe that this escapism effectively debilitated the German liberalism (with the final prevalence of Nazism in 1933 as the late effect of the trend). The *Sonderweg* thesis has been broadly criticised in the recent thirty-odd years, and thus its rejection is not a particularly novel move; however, it is in a very interesting and out-of-the-ordinary way that Quinn argues in favour of the view that the switch into cultural activity was *not* a form of escapism, while the strife for transforming the culture was no less important for the liberal thought than political endeavours. Consequently, the German liberals' switch from political into cultural activities cannot be interpreted as attesting to a weak constitution of the German liberalism. I find these arguments mostly convincing (though the element of escapism does seem obvious to me); the section under discussion is one of the most interesting moments in this book.

Following up the preceding issues, the fourth chapter analyses the 'war' waged inside the German musical milieu between the followers of the 'programme' music, which was meant to illustrate certain ideas or psychical conditions, and the 'autonomists' – that is, adherents of 'pure' music, one whose only means of artistic expression was the sound. Liszt was a leading adherent of programme music; he was supported to this end by his son-in-law, Richard Wagner. Programme music was associated with the hope for

widening the group of listeners, whilst pure music appealed to a narrow group of elitist recipients.

Chapter Five addresses Liszt's recurring interest in matters Hungarian, in parallel with his increasing religious involvement, which was crowned with his entry in the Third Order of Saint Francis. The element of cultural contextualisation seems to be the weakest at this point – as if the author were less knowledgeable in issues regarding the Catholic Church and the Hungarian history, compared to the other problems. However, the perception of the nineteenth century as an epoch of 're-confessionalisation' and increased religiosity, with Liszt's individual piety being seen as a manifestation of growing interest in religion among European cultural elites, is worth of attention.

Lastly, Chapter Six covers Liszt's latest years, the time he spent travelling between Weimar, Rome, and Budapest. The focus here is on his involvement in the German musical milieu, part of it being the *Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein*. The role of music in the development of German national awareness is emphasised, along with Liszt's own conviction that culture is capable of supporting the national movement whilst also alleviating its aggressiveness. In line with the 'Weimar' tradition, which was Goethean at its root, and which was enthusiastically professed by Liszt, the Germans were regarded as a 'Kulturnation' – a nation that becomes materialised and fulfils its potential through culture, and is open to the other nations; a nation, moreover, whose cosmopolitan nature, of a sort, is part of its very essential identity. In the second half of the nineteenth century, as the aggressiveness of the nationalisms grew exacerbated, such understanding of national identity appeared increasingly anachronous. As Quinn remarks, Liszt belonged to an age when a national identification did not yet have to be exclusivistic. His Hungarian patriotism, German patriotism, fondness for France (the country where he made his reputation), his loyalty towards the Habsburgs, and his Catholic religiousness all made up a harmonious whole in his *Weltanschauung*. Yet, a syncretic worldview of this kind was gradually moving away in the latter half of the century.

The book is readable, and it really has several interesting things to tell us about nineteenth-century culture. While I have already tried to summarise the key observations, a number of detailed remarks can be added to this set. Among the latter, I should mention the strife of the age's rulers for a cultural compromise with the bourgeoisie (p. 121); or, the reappearing references to the various contexts in which the musical ideas overlapping with the national ideas in the Romanticism age – with all the ensuing problems. Lastly, adoption by Liszt of his own subjectivities is the issue that forms one of the leading axes of this book. The tension between the real experience and theatricality, between individual sensing and the models of sensing imposed by a culture whose part Liszt himself was, cannot possibly produce any clear settlement or resolution, but it does provide quite a quantity of material for reflection. According to the intensified strife for 'authenticity', so characteristic

of Romanticism, was, as it were, a correlate of the modernisation transition: the sense of uncertainty triggered by the external change elicited a psychological need to get embedded in 'the inner truths' (pp. 32–3).

As a weak point of this study, I would point out something that is hard to precisely demonstrate with use of concrete quotations – namely, a feeling of interpretative superficiality and, as if, glossing over the problems. The permanent referencing to psychoanalysis, in an extremely shallow manner, is a little irritating: as if it should be obvious that the sabre strapped to Liszt's waist on a caricature drawing is an 'obvious phallic symbol' (p. 92). While I do not deny psychoanalytic(al) interpretations as such, I would instead prefer to hear some arguments supporting the legitimacy of such an interpretation in the given case. Superficial are also the references to the term 'Central Europe' used in the title; the mention about Liszt's 'Central European' identity lacks any supporting evidence. One gets the impression (without getting it explained) that the author considers 'Central Europe' to be German-speaking lands plus Hungary; apart from a few mentions of Chopin, Poland does not appear in the book – as if it were not part of it.

'Central Europe', as a term or idea, has no analytical function in this study and it might have not appear there at all without a detriment to the whole thing. The region, while territorially undefined, is ascribed in several moments some rather stereotypical features, its apparently dominant multilinguality among them. The linguistic landscape of various European languages is an immensely complicated issue – and simplifications of the sort do not make its comprehension any easier. As is customary with American books, the reference literature published earlier than twenty or twenty-five years ago is virtually inexistent. Which is a pity, since a few good old books, if well thought-over, would have helped the author in a number of moments (to mention Meinecke's *Weltbürgertum und Nationalstaat* – with respect to German patriotism and its evolution).

Of the minor errors, the author apparently believes that the mediaeval 'Hungarian constitution' was a concrete, written-down document (while a 'constitution' may refer to the political system as such, and not just a written document defining its principles; see p. 67); that Saint Stephen of Hungary lived in the thirteenth century (p. 191); and, that "the Pope issued a statement of Papal Infallibility" in 1870 (*ibidem*) – rather than, matter-of-factly, the Vatican Council adopted the relevant dogma. Such trifle things (related, mainly, to Church and Hungarian affairs), quite sparse indeed, do not affect the content of the study – while they do reinforce the sense of interpretative superficiality. All in all, we deal with a good and interesting, if slightly superficial book which proposes several important interpretative ideas – and I do have the feeling that I have read it to my advantage.

Bálint Varga, *The Monumental Nation: Magyar Nationalism and Symbolic Politics in Fin-de-siècle Hungary*, Berghahn Books, New York and Oxford, 2016, 286 pp., ill., tables, glossary, a map, indexes; series: Austrian and Habsburg Studies, 20

This rather short book by a young Hungarian historian is an excellent study in politics of history. With a very short time span (end of nineteenth/beginning of twentieth century) and limited territory (five specified localities) covered, the study brings to foreground a series of important phenomena, some of them astonishingly topical today. These include nationalism, the powerfulness of national and religious symbols, ethnic identities, backwardness and modernisation, and collective memory. It is with real pleasure that this wise and witty book reads: its vivid and ironical style is in contrast with the monumental subject of the story recounted.

Composed of three sections preceded by a brief introduction, the book deals with the circumstances of unveiling a series of monuments commemorating the ne-thousand years' anniversary of the 'land-taking' (Hun.: *honfoglalás*) – the date which marks the arrival of the Magyars in the Hungarian Lowland in the late ninth century. The project was initiated by the Romanticist historian Kálmán Thaly. This tireless editor of modern-age sources, some of which he forged in his own hand, managed to persuade the Government that the date should be celebrated by means of lasting signs of memory. The date was actually conventional, as no exact moment in the history had been determined: due to delayed preparatory work, the year 1896 was finally agreed upon. This is how the 'statuomania' entered Hungary, in a big way – a phenomenon that had previously developed in the west of Europe, mainly in Germany. Its local, Hungarian specificity is the central subject of Bálint Varga's book.

The first (and the shortest) section makes us concisely acquainted with the home policies pursued by Hungary after the 1867 Austro-Hungarian Compromise. Triumphalism, an attitude appearing among the country's political elite at the time, seemed to have been well grounded then. The *Kulturkampf* waged against the Catholic Church after the Prussian model led to a series of successful events: civilian marriage was introduced in 1895, and the State took over the keeping of registers of births, deaths and marriages. Jews as well as the unbelieving gained rights equal to those enjoyed by the Catholics and the Protestants. The movements developing from within, such as socialists and non-Magyar ethnicities, posed no threat to the ruling national liberals. Hungary's international position was sound.

The millennium monuments were meant to express the strength which the Hungarian state emanated, and represent the Hungarian state doctrine to the other countries and to its own citizens. As far as the latter were concerned, the locations selected for the monuments were of key importance. The second

section discusses this particular aspect. Only two of the seven were to be erected on the ethnically Magyar territory: in the vicinity of the Pannonhalma Abbey and in Pusztaszer, between Szeged and Keckemét. The other ones towered above localities populated mostly by non-Magyar people, some of whom were rather critical about the state's policies. Two monuments were built in what is today Slovakia, on the Devín (Hun.: Dévény; Ger.: Theben) hill near Bratislava (then called Pozsony), amidst the ruins of a Great Moravian castle, and in Nitra, a town that was dominated by Catholic Church institutions. A monument twin to that of Devín, showing a vigilant warrior holding a sword in his hand pulled down, was erected on a hill outside Brassó (Rom.: Braşov; Ger.: Kronstadt), the city then populated mainly by Transylvanian Saxons and Romanians. Mukačevo (bearing the name Munkács at the time) had an even lesser number of Magyars: dominant in the locality were the Rusnaks and orthodox Jews who consistently disregarded any secular authority. The last of the millenary commemorative epitomes became a tourist attraction of Zemun (Hun.: Zimony; Ger.: Semlin) – a district of Belgrade today, then located within the autonomous Croatia. Such a selection of the places where the symbols of Hungarian domination were erected doubtlessly attested to a from-above character of the millennium commemoration project. The monuments were funded by the central authorities, and the local communities were mostly told to accept them erected in their area. The grassroots initiatives, such as the postulate put forth by the Benedictines of Pannonhalma to commemorate also their first abbot, named Astrik, on the occasion of the millenary anniversary, were rejected. The locations chosen on advice of Thaly were no less telling. Save for Zemun, they were situated outside the cities, preferably on the hill towering above the town, so that everybody could see it clearly that the monuments were not meant to become objects of some local cult but epitomised the power and authority stretching across the country. In Pannonhalma, a *via dolorosa* had to be dismantled to enable the erection; in Devín and Mukačevo the ruins of the local castles were fractured, whereas the Pusztaszer monument was erected in the midst of a void. It called for taking a more or less long trip to see most of these monuments from close-up. The message behind the millennium and the majesty of the state was explained in the document that was walled in each of the monument's foundations together with the cornerstone "thou shalt stand as long as the homeland stands."

The thus defined character of the land-taking monuments impressed a clear mark on how they were perceived. This problem is discussed in the third section, which opens with a description of the circumstances of the unveiling of the monuments, which in many of the cases was the first occasion ever to more clearly mark the Magyar presence in an ethnically alien environment. Yet, controversies did appear. In Zemun and Braşov, an international embitterment occurred. Protests against Budapest's aggressive symbolic politics appeared in Bucharest, Belgrade, and Zagreb. Some of the unveiling ceremonies were

boycotted; the press was getting outraged by ‘scandals’ such as the Romanian schoolgirls pinning a ribbon on the ceremonial day onto a cat, rather than wearing it themselves. Where the ethnic conflict did not involve animals, the ceremony influenced the local politics, accelerating a polarisation into less or more nationalistic camps among representatives of non-Magyar nations, or caused that state investments in the local economies could, apparently legitimately, be expected. From the town-hall’s standpoint, the symbolic dictate of the capital city also provoked the locals to think in terms of potential benefits for their own town.

In spite of the exacerbations, the celebrations were mostly peaceful, although the participating public rarely expressed their spontaneous enthusiasm. The attendees, predominantly school students, were brought or driven to the site rather than encouraged to spontaneously participate. Their quite lukewarm reception of the millenary agenda was partly caused by the appearance of the monuments and the ideological programme behind them. The Magyar symbols – Árpád, Magyar warriors, and the *turul* birds – were predominant, whereas no symbols were featured with which the non-Magyar people could have identified themselves. The social programme related to the monuments was limited and consequently, so was their social influence. The lower classes could find in their symbolism nothing to identify with. The celebration was clearly about a gift offered by the (male exponents of) the Magyar middle class to themselves (pp. 207, 234). Mukačevó seems to have been an interesting exception to the rule: the local Rusnak elite cherished the myth of a thousand years of brotherhood relationship with the Magyars. The millennium celebration offered a development opportunity for the otherwise backwater town immersed in economic and civilisational inanition.

The book’s most important part consists of the last chapters which deal with the practical questions related to the designing, construction and maintenance of the monuments and how they actually functioned in the public space. The author skilfully imparts the details concerning organisational and artistic problems that had to be tackled in respect of the prestigious project. An unexpected side effect is also pointed out: the Magyar monuments became an incentive for several local communities to erect their own monuments, often with a polemic ideological purport. The German townsmen of Pressburg (so was Bratislava called in German) counteracted the Devín warrior with a monument in honour of Empress Maria Theresa. Their Kronstadt compatriots responded to the provocation by erecting a statue of Johannes Honterus, the religious reformer. The Benedictine Friars of Pannonhalma finally founded an obelisk in homage of Abbot Astrik by themselves. Even more spectacular responses occurred locally. The Romanians blew up the monument in Braşov; the other statues were demolished during and just after the First World War, with the new owners ruthlessly removing the traces of the Hungarian rule. Two of the monuments have survived in a good condition. Initially rather rarely

visited, the God-forsaken locality of Pusztaszer became a popular destination for tourists. The millennium tower of Zemun has become a landmark of Belgrade.

Varga's study tells the story in an approachable way. The addenda such as the multilingual glossary of geographic names and Hungarian census data concerning the localities described in the book are most valuable and helpful to the reader. The censuses that sought to establish the language spoken and religion professed by the local communities have often been criticised as fundamentally false. The author's own view in this respect is much more moderate, but it does not have to be shared (the undersigned would personally be more sceptical about the issue). These data are certainly the only ones of the sort and thus are 'necessarily the best'; even if not corresponding with the reality, they at least should enable to grasp certain demographic regularities for a longer period of time.

The study is based on a rich literature, including Romanian, Yugoslavian (Serbian and Croatian), Slovakian, and German studies. The author is excellently versed in the problems of memory and memorisation in the European context. His studies focused on the individual millennium monuments are based on a broad query across, probably, all and any archive that could have been expected to contain the relevant material. The state archives of Hungary, Serbia, Croatia, Romania, Slovakia and Ukraine have been searched, along with regional and church annals and files. The query is complemented by an impressive list of press articles written around 1896. Given the multilingual sources used, the fact that the errors occurring in the spelling of personal and other names are really rare calls for appreciation.

The advantages and strong points of the Varga book are numerous: it is well documented, smartly written, and pleasant to read. All this makes one ponder to what extent this fascinating case study in Hungarian symbolic politics informs the way we perceive the history of pre-Trianon Hungary. The answer must be imposing: in spite of the subject-matter, narrow as it is in itself, Varga has enriched the dominant picture of Hungarian home politics (with respect to the nationalities, in the first place) with the local dimensions, which rarely occurs there. In his concept, apart from the state that (super) imposes the language, culture and interpretation of history to its nation, there are local actors entering into bargaining with the state. The point here is not about merely reversing a top-down perspective into a bottom-up one. The history of the millenary monuments shows that symbolic politics was perpetrated by numerous actors in a variety of fields. The resistance offered to the narratives imposed by Budapest – and to the complex of actions constituting the Magyarisation policy – was not the only option. Local communities sometimes tended to develop their own politics of memory, competitive but not antagonistic against the one pursued by the central agents. The specificity of the ultraconservative Jewish community of Mukačevo created

an instance of refusal to participate in any state-managed affair. On the other hand, Budapest's initiatives and doings oftentimes lacked consistency and clout. Moreover, they also suffered from all the illnesses of a country that works its way up: paralysis and organisational chaos, susceptibility to corruption, and incompetence across the levels of authority. All these aspects render the image of Hungary in the late nineteenth century even more complex, but thus certainly richer and more interesting.

trans. *Tristan Korecki*

Maciej Górny

Wiktor Marzec, *Rebelia i reakcja. Rewolucja 1905 roku i plebejskie doświadczenie polityczne* [Rebellion and Reaction. The Revolution of 1905 and the Plebeian Political Experience], Universitas, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź and Kraków, 2016, 236 pp.; series: *Horyzonty nowoczesności*, 118

Wiktor Marzec's background is clearly reflected in his recent book: he is a sociologist, rather than a historian. Although he discusses events that occurred more than a hundred years ago, *Rebellion and reaction* is not a classical historical study in its broad inclusion of philosophical issues – and, certain theoretical ambitions. As emphasised by the author in the conclusive section, his monograph covers the period in which the ethnic concept of nation was taking shape – to remain prevalent in Poland to this day. Hence, the proposed findings might, as Marzec believes, be of some relevance for the later (and present-day) political life in Poland.

The 'plebeian political experience' is, expectedly, the focus of this study. Central to this experience was the political mobilisation of masses, which took place on such scale for the first time during the Russian Revolution of 1905. The said mobilisation is investigated from a triple standpoint, reflected in the tripartite arrangement of the book. The first part ('Rebellion') describes the process of spontaneous, bottom-up mobilisation of workers, who in a revolutionary situation get self-organised, put forth their postulates, and take action not limited to political considerations but extending to cultural and educational aspects. The second part ('Revolution') discusses the political parties and organisations in the time of the Revolution: their stance towards the workers, and the ways in which these parties/organisations tried to influence them; the workers' issues in the programmes of these parties/organisations. Finally, the third part ('Reaction') focuses entirely on the National Democracy and the evolution of this political group's attitude toward social democratisation that stemmed from the revolutionary developments. The basic problem addressed in section part is the National Democracy's departure from the

democratic ideals advocated by its followers in the pre-revolutionary period and adoption of elitistic ideas; connected with this is the replacement of this organisation of the former conservative groupings in the political arena.

The first part is probably the most interesting section from the standpoint of 'traditional' historiography. For the most part, it analyses leaflets from the Revolution period. The author considers the extent to which such a specific type of source can inform us about the senders *as well as* the recipients; that is, how deep an insight can be into the psyche, worldview, and expectations of the 'no-source-generating' strata, represented by the leaflet readers. True, such an approach implies the assumption that the compilers of the leaflet messages – the vast majority of whom were educated individuals associated with different political parties – had some idea about what the expectations of the recipients might be, and adapted their messages accordingly, thus not letting their messages being received in a vacuum. This assumption is, I believe, completely legitimate, and the author's argument can be followed with interest. The final subsection of part one analyses several autobiographies of worker parties' activists whose background was the working class, with the aim to present the typical ways in which the working-class youth were attaining the awareness of their situation, and turning politically active.

The second part also revolves around the leaflets – not as the main source, though, but as an element accompanying the political programmes, memoirs, press articles, and other material. Leaflets are examined at this point from a different angle: a reconstruction is attempted of the awareness of the recipients, rather than the senders. The point is, what rhetorical strategies were employed by each of the political parties; what vision of the world, and place of the workers in such a world, they attempted to instil in the addressees. The glaringly outstanding differences between the purport of the messages communicated through the leaflets distributed by the social democrats and the National Democrats are worth of one's attention no less than the differences between the leaflets of the Social Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland [Pol.: *Socjaldemokracja Królestwa Polskiego*, SDKP] and those of the Polish Socialist Party [Pol.: *Polska Partia Socjalistyczna*, PPS]. Marzec notes that the socialist leaflets tended to create a community bond between the message compiler and the recipient (incl. by using the first person singular) – whilst their National-Democratic counterparts used the second person singular, thus intensifying the air of separateness between the authors and the readers. The proposed conclusions regarding the difference between the National Democratic and socialist publications are very interesting (and worth being checked based on a broader source material): the former offered different pictures of the world depending on the recipient – worker, or intellectual, whereas the social democrats described a world in the same manner, regardless of the projected addressee. Interesting is also the analysis of the leaflets produced by the National Workers' Union [Pol.: *Narodowy Związek Robotniczy*, NZR], a rightist

organisation close to the National Democracy which endeavoured (for which there is source evidence) to maintain its independent position and contributed, at least in the initial period, to political emancipation of workers.

Part 3 is the most sophisticated theoretically. Referring to a number of philosophers and political theorists, the author proposes, basically, the following pattern of National Democracy's transition from democracy, or democratism, to authoritarianism. In the first period of its activity, the ND assumed a broad concept of 'people' [the Polish *lud* otherwise denotes 'common people' or 'folk'], extending to the nation as a whole. Since such an understanding was not obvious at the time yet, it had a democratising potential to it. However, astonished with the society's radicalisation in the course of the 1905 Revolution, the formation increasingly often emphasised the importance of a nationally conscious elite. Subsequently, the notion of 'people'/'nation' was narrowed again, and finally referred to nationally conscious ethnic Poles (whatever 'ethnic' should have meant). The author argues, very interestingly, that the vague vision of nation among National Democrats (ethnic, historical, cultural, or biological?), causing so much trouble to historians, did not arise from a negligence or carelessness of ND theoreticians, and from a coexistence of various ideological threads within the formation's thought. This incoherence was, instead, part of its concept, for membership in the nation was supposed to be an emotional experience, not subject to reasonable explanation. No less interesting is the consideration of the meaning and significance of the metaphors employed: the author highlights the role of biological imagery, which intensified during the Revolution and after its eventual failure. As convincingly argued by Marzec, the use of such imagery is not explainable solely in terms of the educational background of Roman Dmowski himself (he had a degree in Natural Sciences). Biological metaphors contributed to progressing biologisation of the concept of nation, which in turn reinforced exclusivist attitudes: with use of an easy argument provided by this process, groups regarded as unwelcome (for any reason) could be left outside the limits of the Nation. Anti-Semitic attitudes are not covered in detail, since the author believes the issue is fairly well examined.

One of the key arguments put forth in the third part is that the Polish elites (the liberals or the Catholic Church to be mentioned along with National Democrats) were astonished at the eruption of grassroots social activity during the Revolution (the 'reaction' in the section's title refers to these developments, among other things). It is the response to the spontaneous activity that Marzec identifies as the reason for why the ND shifted rightward. To his mind, the Revolution has abolished the possibility to pursue policies built on sustainable and unshaken foundation. The National Democrats wanted the foundation restored, and thus sought to respond to the old questions in the new situation. The foundations of yore, such as the tradition or the religious sanction, proved useless now; radical nationalism came in their place.

Wiktor Marzec's book, very interesting and innovative in many ways as it is, shows new perspectives for research in the 1905 Revolution – though it might have seemed that the topic has been studied in depth. Of the various interpretative traditions it is grounded in, the one of research into the history of concepts (Ger.: *Begriffsgeschichte*), in the spirit of Reinhardt Koselleck, is the most interesting one for a historian. Reciprocal interdependence of soci(et)al history and history of political language is one of the key methodological assumptions behind the study, and such interrelationship is well demonstrated indeed. Yet, the author's extensive methodological awareness has not made this book purely theoretical: on the contrary, albeit not a historian, Wiktor Marzec has carried out a thorough source-based work by analysing the leaflets and other records in detail, and successfully extracting the meanings that have never before attracted the historians' attention to a satisfactory degree. In effect, the study combines empirical historical research and theoretical setting. For a historian – and not so much for a sociologist or political scientist – one of the most interesting problems is the differentiation between the bottom-up activity of common people and such activities that were instigated by the political parties. These two types of conduct are not always clearly differentiable, but the formulation of the problem and the attempt at analysing it is an important achievement in itself.

With all these words of praise, it should not be concealed that the book contains certain – mostly formal, and at times content-related, deficiencies. As to the formal facet, one might consider whether the theoretical sections must be so lengthy indeed; whether it is always necessary to secure oneself with a citation from some highly-esteemed philosophers in order to propose a conclusion that is apparently commonsensical. An example of the latter is that entanglements of various long-existing phenomena may lead to the appearance of a novel phenomenon. Some of the problems might have probably been exposed in a less complex manner; does the poor reader really need to know what a 'catachresis', or 'aleatoric', means? On the other hand, though, so many studies written by Polish historians suffer from complete lack of any theoretical perspective; hence, a monograph based on a thoroughly thought-over methodological approach deserves praise rather than critique.

The misspellings or misprints are apparently chargeable on the publisher (rather than the author), though they do not make the comprehension of this uneasy text any easier.

My objections as to the content or substance primarily concern a few issues of marginal significance for the central topic addressed. To (repeatedly) state that the changes in the Russian Empire's politics and internal situation which stemmed from the Revolution of 1905 were superficial or apparent is an oversimplification. To my mind, these changes were critical; the political life of the Empire, the Kingdom of Poland included, evolved afterwards in conditions entirely different compared to those prevailing before. The similarities between

the liberals' and the National Democrats' attitudes toward the Revolution are shown too precipitately. The liberal paternalism was, after all, different from the nationalistic paternalism (to cut, for now, the long story short). One could, furthermore, not avoid doubting whether anti-Semitism was in the worker milieus merely an effect of the National Democratic propaganda (as it might seem from the text). And, it may be pondered whether the Revolution in question was an upheaval so crucial as the author perceives it; to this end, the evolution of the political language in use in Poland from the Enlightenment age onwards would need being examined. Such investigation might lead to the finding that in, for instance, the Kościuszko period, or among the exponents of the Great Emigration, or during the Spring of Nations, certain phenomena could be spotted which are approached as novel ones in this book. Finally, I would personally polemicise against the author's observation that the National Democrats' ethnic concept of nation was an important factor behind the formation's evolution toward authoritarianism. In fact, an ethnic understanding of nation (which means ethno-cultural, rather than racist) was commonplace at the time, and 'professed' in East Central Europe by almost all the authors referring to the subject – including adherents of a broadest national tolerance (the leaders of the Austro-Marxists among them). I am positive that it was not the assumption of an ethnic vision of nation that proved critical for the National Democracy's authoritarian-oriented evolution.

Back to the core aspects: I was wondering while reading this book how far the author's apparent, and overtly declared, sympathy for his plebeian characters, and for the socialist formations fighting for their emancipation, might have informed his own line of thinking. It might at some points seem that a reader who does not share the author's philosophical views will not have to accept the outcome of his analytic effort. It may also be guessed that certain National Democratic texts are interpreted with a slightly malicious bias: what I am saying is, their purport could be interpreted in more moderate terms. However, with a closer examination, one finds that expressing one's own views – this being the right of any research scholar – does not affect or depreciate the scientific character of the reflections and conclusions proposed by him (or her): they can be accepted, or denied, by any reader regardless of his/her philosophical or historical views.

In sum, my assessment of Wiktor Marzec's study is definitely positive – albeit the book under review is not flawless, and my view on certain points varies from that proposed by the author. Given the multiplicity of lacklustre, atheoretical, often intellectually shallow studies, this particular one offers the reader a real respite: the author's deep concern with the topic investigated shines through every single page. He is clearly passionate about certain problems of significance, rather than striving to present several 'new' and completely abstract facts – as, regrettably, all too often happens with historians. It is a very interesting piece of reading, and one can follow the cohesive

and logical argumentation offered. The subjects tackled are really important in terms of Polish history. The study broadens the reader's mind, and is debate-provoking. I wish there were more such books!

trans. *Tristan Korecki*

Maciej Janowski

Agata Zysiak, *Punkty za pochodzenie. Powojenna modernizacja i uniwersytet w robotniczym mieście* [Extra Points in Recognition of Background. Post-war Modernisation and University in Working-class-dominated Town], Zakład Wydawniczy 'Nomos', Kraków, 2016, 342 pp., bibliog., indices, ill., Summary in English

Agata Zysiak is a cultural sociologist employed as associate professor with the University of Łódź. Her scholarly interests encompass a broadly defined historical sociology and biographical research. In spite of her young age, Zysiak boasts considerable scholarly experience gained at the CEU in Budapest, with the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and the Free University in Berlin. She has recently pursued comparative studies, at the University of Warsaw, focused on transition of the working class in post-industrial urban areas in the United States and Poland.

The study under review, being a reedited doctoral thesis originally compiled at the Łódź University, is Zysiak's debut book. Importantly in this context, she had co-authored (with Kaja Kazimierska and Katarzyna Waniek) a volume entitled *Opowiedzieć uniwersytet. Łódź akademicka w biografjach wpisanych w losy Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego* [Telling a university-story. Łódź the academic city viewed through biographies associated with the University of Łódź] (Łódź, 2015), which offers an interesting regard on the history of the Łódź academy in light of the autobiographical interviews collected by the three authors.

The existing studies on the history of the Łódź University have predominantly been anniversary-related/commemorative studies, such as the one by Jarosław Kita and Stefan Pytlas (*Uniwersytet Łódzki w latach 1945–1995* [Łódź, 1996]). The history of the University penned by its former Rector Wiesław Puś (*Zarys historii Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego 1945–2015* [Łódź, 2015]) proposes an even deeper approach. Yet, a comparative perspective rarely tends to occur in these studies – be it countrywide or global. Seen against this background, Zysiak's book proposes a definitely original concept, carried out to a high methodological standard, which is based on perceiving the University's history as part of the modernisation of tertiary education in post-war Poland and, more broadly, in the international progress of modernity.

The list of references at the study's end is not quite on a par with what is customary with historiographic texts: there is no categorisation into historic

sources and scholarly literature; a part of the source material is not identified at all. This is true for the press, among other items. However, the impression remains that the author has carried out a thorough query encompassing a variety of source testimonies and made use of considerable literature, including foreign (predominantly, in English). Her eruditeness based on historiographic literature calls for a special mention.

The study under review has a problem-oriented structure and is composed of six mutually correspondent chapters, an introduction and a conclusion. A reference reading list, a set of tables, a subject index and an index of personal names (both useful) are appended.

The first chapter, entitled 'Modernisation, pre-war years and a revolution', is introductory as it outlines the terminological and historical background for further considerations. The democratisation of access to higher-level education is approached as a trend within the global modernisation process, the post-war Poland being seen as one of the possible exemplifications of the process. The author proposes essential methodological declarations at this point: referring to the categorisations known from the Western Sovietology, she rejects the totalitarian model to the benefit of a revisionist concept. Following Pierre Bourdieu's approach, she takes a critical stance toward the model of a "trammelled or captive academy which is subjected to the pressure of the political field" – the thread we will refer to below.

Chapter Two analyses three models of university whose implementation was attempted in the University of Łódź after 1945. The first of the models analysed, described as liberal, followed to an extent the interwar-period tradition, its exponent having been the philosopher Tadeusz Kotarbiński, the University's first rector. The 'socialised university' model, which was pushed forth by his opponent, sociologist Józef Chałasiński, rooted in the experience of the Free Polish University [Wolna Wszechnica Polska]. The third, socialist model, was matter-of-factly introduced in the Stalinist time, under Chałasiński's term-of-office as Rector.

Chapter Three attempts to reconstruct the soci(et)al *imaginarium* that accompanied the reform of the tertiary education system and the implantation of the idea of university in a working-class-dominated city. The argument is mainly based in this section upon the regional press and preserved memoirs records. The question is addressed of how a 'socialist university' was meant to function and to what an extent was the idea internalised by the young generation of the time.

Chapter Four focuses on effects of the modernisation and democratisation of the Łódź academy, shown through a reconstruction of the world of the local students (not only of the tertiary level). In her evaluation of the social effects of the reform of science and implementation of the socialist university model, the author explicitly opts for the marginalised classes which in the realities of post-war Poland were given the opportunity for social advancement.

Zysiak seeks to highlight the true heroes of the modernisation of the higher education: namely, the peasant and working-class youth.

The sixth, and crowning, chapter, entitled 'The academic model of career', traces the career paths of some of the University employees in an attempt to describe the ways in which the democratisation influenced the staff, modifying their careers and personal profiles of those who were to become research workers. Of key importance to the argument at this point are the limits of democratisation of the tertiary education and how the process was impacted by two contradictory forces – namely, the 'old academy' model (under reproduction then) rooted in the two interwar decades and the political and legal changes related to the socialist modernisation project.

The conclusions the author comes to basically boil down to the following. First, the modernisation project under analysis ended up in a failure. In spite of repeated efforts of the authorities, the University, although it faced an opportunity to become an "egalitarian tertiary school, open to the working classes", actually joined the "process of reproduction of a traditional academy" (p. 291). This was predominantly determined by the resistance offered by the University's habitus against political pressure and reforms enforced by the authorities. Thus, no democratisation actually occurred: what did happen was that university-level education was popularised, but in statistical terms it was a far cry from the target set by the authorities (it was assumed that, resulting from the revolutionary transition, 80 per cent of the people from each year of birth would complete tertiary education, whilst the actual rate never exceeded 10 per cent before the People's Republic came to an end).

Second, universities as institutions – and the University of Łódź in particular – never actually became the site of social change, a breeding ground for young human resources. Rather than that, they became a space where "divisions and hierarchies were transmitted, providing the framework for cultural conversion rather than emancipation" (p. 301). As is conclusively attested by the autobiographies of selected Łódź-based scholars analysed in the book, the young people setting out on the path of university career soon turned into defenders of conservative values, cherished an idealised vision of science and the traditional master-student relationship.

The author argues, thirdly, that the concept of a new socialist university "never became a ready-to-apply solution imported from the USSR: it was a model that was taking shape locally in the course of debates and institutional clashes" (p. 298). Moreover, the idea of a new university was emerging in confrontation with the central authorities who expected implementation of the tasks set from above.

The book undoubtedly provokes reflection and encourages to rethink some of the established concepts; yet, it also triggers doubts and inspires a number of questions. A considerable value of this study lies in that it criticises the totalitarian paradigm that has been predominant in the research

on post-war communist Poland, shows a new research perspective anchored in the sociological inspiration (Bourdieu, Charles Taylor), one that proposes a different distribution of focus in the authority vs. society relationship.

Let me now point out a few issues that, as I believe, deserve being discussed in more detail¹ – beginning with a comparison between the aforesaid totalitarian and revisionist models. The assumptions behind them undoubtedly create, as it were, two mutually competitive visions of the past. Within the former, what we encounter is history seen from the above, with political occurrences taking the predominant role. This concept emphasises the role of ideologies superimposed by the state, as constitutive for the category of totalitarianism, where the past is often imbued with an explicitly heroic purport. Such a vision concentrates on a ‘centre’, recognised in terms of power/authority (for instance), neglecting a ‘periphery’ (local structures).

The revisionist model creates a completely different version of history: namely, the past as seen in a bottom-up perspective, with an emphasis on social history which refers to the role of social classes rather than outstanding individuals. In this version, history privileges the locality, shedding light on its complicated relations with the centre.

The author’s apparent adherence to the revisionist model makes one doubt whether the totalitarian model has nothing more on offer and ought to be referred back to the completely outdated Foucaultian toolbox? Zysiak would offer us no clear reply to this. While she vows that the purpose behind her book is basically to “complement the narrative of ‘enthralled post-war academy’ and the young generation seduced by the [communist] system” (p. 17), the general purport of her study is, clearly, a vote for ‘de-totalitarianisation’ of studies in the phenomenon labelled ‘People’s Republic of Poland’.

There are more questions that appear consequently: Is it not the case that the author’s choice of a neutral and quite general descriptive language, characteristic basically of historical sociology, renounces the ambience of the period 1945–56 with its peculiar climate of terror, overwhelming fear and state violence? Is it not so that the focus on theoretical categories such as social change, socialist modernisation, progress, building of a socialist welfare state, makes it difficult to adequately describe the assumptions behind, and the self-destructiveness, of the socialist utopia? And, lastly, can one analyse the post-war change in the tertiary education system apart from the ideological context that accompanied the communist doctrine?

The horror and awe of those years, which is evident in the period records (diaries, letters, newspapers), cannot be sensed while reading the Zysiak book;

¹ In this part of my review, I refer to the opinions voiced by the participants (namely, Agata Zysiak, Joanna Wawrzyniak, Andrzej Rostocki, and the under-signed) of a meeting promoting the book which was held on 7 June 2017 at the Museum of Art in Łódź.

what is more, the dramatic or tragic entanglements of the people concerned appear not quite comprehensible. Referring to the “lonesome Kotarbiński”, the author seems not to quite appreciate the fact that the former rector paid a personal price for his attempt to defend the idea of liberty for science, whereas the failure of the vision of the university he pushed forward was set in a broader, undoubtedly ideology-laden, context. Similarly challengeable is the proposed interpretation of the achievements of Kotarbiński’s adversary, Józef Chałasiński: his reform of the higher-education system was, in Zysiak’s view, “not an attempt at opportunistically attuning to the prevalent transition: rather than that, it expressed the hopes related to the potential behind the radical reforms combined with the desire for secured independence of universities in the new political conditions” (p. 70).

There is probably no coincidence in the fact that the revisionist paradigm applied in this study demeans the aforementioned issues related to violence (symbolic and not only), repression or persecution. The author evidently neglects the propagandist campaign unleashed by Chałasiński and his associates against Kotarbiński, with the notorious book by Bronisław Baczko on the latter’s philosophical and socio-political views (*O poglądach filozoficznych i społeczno-politycznych Tadeusza Kotarbińskiego* [Warszawa, 1951]) as its climax. She acquits the whole story with a not-quite-convincing extenuation of a noted sociologist and a single quote from the Baczko book (pp. 88–9). Also, we are told nothing about the fates of the persecuted scholars, one of them being Rajmund Gostkowski, an archaeologist who was expelled from the University and imprisoned in the Stalinist period. The events that essentially informed the mass-scale processes and the university life – the year 1948, the October 1956 breakthrough, or the occurrences of March 1968 – are virtually absent in the book.

Doubts – of a different kind, though – arise also because of the way in which the author approaches the language of the sources, as particularly visible in the chapter on the social imaginarius. Zysiak reconstructs them mainly based on the local press but treats these testimonies all too seriously, to my mind, believing that the information given in the press has reflected the essential fragments of the realities of the time. While this is certainly true in regard of everyday life of the students, is it so with respect to mentality as well? Rather unconsciously, the author remains entrapped in the neutral language that prevents her from grasping the mass phenomenon of linguistic manipulation typical of the Stalinist time. She seems to overlook that the totalitarian language contradicted its very basic function: instead of describing the reality, it created a reality. In the 1980s, Jacek Fedorowicz coined the concept describing the adjective ‘socialist(ic)’ as a levelling or neutralising adjective. Seen from such a perspective, a socialist democracy, socialist justice, socialist progress, and so on, had not much to do with their respective real counterparts. A similar ambivalence is characteristic of the other terms

and notions used in the study. To give an example, the ‘extra points’ given in recognition of one’s background offered a chance for some to get a higher education whilst taking such a chance away from others – the fact which Zysiak seems to ignore. The right to work, guaranteed by the Constitution of the People’s Republic, frequently implied coerced labour in the Stalinist period; and so on, and so forth.

Essentially revisionist, the study in question certainly deserves attention as it offers a new voice in the debate on communist Poland, one that rejects the clichés and courageously criticises the findings previously made by authors of established repute. The modernisation perspective applied in describing the history of the forty-five post-war years has long been marginalised – and this for a variety of reasons, including (but not limited to) those enumerated by Zysiak: a sentimental vision of individuals being communist party members; an effect of unconscious indoctrination; or, young people having been seduced by the totalitarian propaganda. While the modernisation was a failure or was ostensible, such an approach is fully legitimate and certainly conforms to scholarly standards, as the book under review proves. There is no coincidence in the fact that the attempt has been made by a member of the young generation. There are serious indications that the reception of the findings of the Łódź-based sociologist is heavily informed by the actual biographical experience of the readers. Those who can remember the communist time, having had their school and university-level education and employment with a tertiary school will not be much enthusiastic about a number of arguments proposed in the book: some of the statements may even cause thorough objection. Which is good, actually: disputes between generations is a natural thing; the book by Zyziak once more attests to the observation that every generation writes its own history.

trans. Tristan Korecki

Rafał Stobiecki