

The Annals of Jan Długosz. Annales seu cronicae incliti regni Poloniae. An English abridgement by Maurice Michael with a commentary by Paul Smith, Cheltenham, Chichester 1997 IMPublications, XXVIII, 673 pp.

This abridged English translation of Jan Długosz's *Annals or Chronicles of the Illustrious Polish Kingdom*, the most important work of Polish medieval historiography, is a popular work. The translator wanted to make it possible for readers unfamiliar with Polish and Latin to get to know the most important Polish chronicle which, according to him "is on a par with Froissart and de Commines".

Maurice Michael, the author of the abridgement, is not a historian but a professional translator. He learned the Polish language during the Second World War when he was assigned to a military mission which collaborated with the First Polish Corps in Scotland. As he himself says, he made friends with many Poles and after the war began to translate Polish literature. The book under review is a result of his friendship with Poles and his interest in Poland.

The *Annals* of Jan Długosz has 673 pages; the book comprises a preface and the author's acknowledgements (pp. VII–IX), a simplified calendar of church holidays (only 58, pp. XI–XII), a list of maps and illustrations (pp. XIII–XVI), historical maps of the territories discussed in the book (pp. XVIII–XXV) as well as maps drawn up specially for this publication (pp. XXVI–XXVII), the translation itself, an abridgement covering the years 965–1480 plus the epilogue (pp. 1–601), without a division into books and volumes, a commentary with a short bibliographic note by Paul Smith (pp. 603–612) and an index of persons and geographical names (pp. 613–673). In the text itself there are 59 maps (at the beginning) and black-and-white illustrations from various 15th–17th century sources. The book has no *apparatus criticus*. Faced with a work of such enormous proportions and not having an adequate knowledge of Latin, the author decided to base his translation on a Polish translation of the *Annals* and make some cuts. He chose the last Cracow translation (Jana Długosza *Roczniki czyli kroniki sławnego Królestwa Polskiego*, ed. by J. Dąbrowski, K. Pieradzka, J. Garbaciak, books 1–11, Warszawa 1961–1985). The Polish translation (Volume 1) is the work of Stanisław Gawęda, Zbigniew Jabłoński, Andrzej Jochełson, Julia Radziszewska, Krystyna Stachowska and Anna Strzelecka; the translation was vetted by Marian Plezia, and the other volumes were translated by Julia Krukówna. Unfortunately, the author does not name the edition from which he translated the final parts of the *Annals*, one can guess that this must have been the old edition and translation (*Joannis Długossi seu Longini Canonici Cracoviensis Opera omnia cura vols. I–XIV A. Przeździecki edita Cracoviae 1863–1887*; volumes II–VI: *Jana Długosza kanonika krakowskiego Dziejów Polski ksiąg dwanaście*, translated by K. Mecerzyński, books 1–12, Kraków 1868–1870).

The author wanted to produce a specific English "guide to the treasures to be found" in Długosz's work, a guide which would be accessible (also, if not primarily, financially) to an ordinary though well-read reader. The author, who is not a historian and who regards Długosz's work "more as a work of literature than as a historical source book", decided to make far-reaching abridgements. He has left out everything that Długosz called a myth or legend and started his translation with the year 965; he has eliminated many of Długosz's repetitions and "lengthy panegyrics of his heroes". Nor was he interested in information concerning territories west of the Oder and east of the Dnieper which, according to him, are adequately documented "elsewhere". On the other hand, he has decided to include (in addition to the core of the *Chronicles*) everything that concerns morals, customs, habits, climatic details, wars, prejudices, suspicions, opinions held in those times and various "curiosities".

What is surprising is that Michael has left out the geographic description of the Polish territories. Expunctions, abridgements and changes are not indicated in the text.

Paul Smith in his commentary supplies mainly information on the life, career and work of Jan Długosz as well as basic data on the origin and sources of the *Annals*. He emphasizes the importance of Długosz's work and the role it played in Polish and European historiography. Unfortunately, like the core of the work, the commentary has no *apparatus criticus*, nor even a list of the publications and sources used. Smith only mentions a few Polish historians, in particular Gerard Lubda, Henryk Łowmiański and Henryk Samsonowicz.

Smith's bibliographic note is mainly for the use of English-speaking readers interested in the events described by Długosz. (Smith regards Norman Davies's *God's Playground. A History of Poland* (vol. 1) published in Oxford in 1989 as the best analysis of these events). Smith knows the original full editions of *Annales* (old and new ones as well as translations), but he only mentions them without any bibliographic information. The final part of the note includes a fragmentary list of Polish literature devoted to Długosz and his works, in particular the collected studies published on the quincentenary of the chronicler's death. Smith does not know (or does not mention) such fundamental works as A. Semkowicz's *Jan Długosz's Critical Analysis of Poland's History* (up to 1384), Kraków 1887; *Annalium Poloniae, Jan Długosz's Critical Analyses of the Years 1385–1480*, ed. S. Gawęda and others, vol. 1, 1385–1444, Wrocław 1961, vol. 2, 1445–1480, Wrocław 1975; Maria Koczerska's *Etat et perspectives des recherches sur Jan Długosz*, "Acta Poloniae Historica" vol. LII, 1985, pp. 171–219, with an excellent summing up of literature also in foreign languages; S. M. Kuczyński's study *The Years of the Thirteen Years' War in Jan Długosz's Annals, 1454–1466*, vols. I–II, Łódź 1964–1965, and the commentaries in the new translation of Długosz's work, e.g. the studies by A. Gąsiorowski, J. Łojko and R. Walczak.

The index of persons and geographical names presents the historical figures, localities, rivers, regions, countries, duchies etc. mentioned in the publication, but unfortunately, there are errors both in names (misprints, orthography) and, what is much worse, in the identification of persons and places.

The publication of the book is undoubtedly an important and most commendable event despite the author's controversial assumptions and translation methods. The amount of work put in by the author is admirable. Let us also admit that Michael is fully aware of his shortcomings and plans to bring out a supplement to correct the mistakes he made.

The editorial side of the publication leaves much to be desired (it is not clear whether any scientific editing was done. Paul Smith is named only as the author of the commentary). There is also a lack of uniformity in geographical names. Place names are in Latin, Polish, German and English even on the maps. The author also had trouble with the names of persons and places in the index, e.g. Sromowce (in the Polish translation) figures as Sromowiec in the index and, to make things worse, it is placed in Hungary; Andrzej Tęczyński appears under three different names (Andrew de Teczyn, Andrew de Tęczyn (Tęczyński) and Andrew Teczynski). Let us also mention the orthographic errors in the names of places and persons cited in the Polish language, e.g. "Gdansk, Breźnica, Nowe Miasto Korczyń" are by no means isolated cases. The list of errors, mistakes and shortcomings could be multiplied.

Nevertheless, the translation shows the greatness of Długosz's work to English-speaking readers who know neither Latin nor Polish and this is the chief merit of the publication.

Michał Zbieranowski

Stände und Landesherrschaft in Ostmitteleuropa in der frühen Neuzeit, ed. Hugo Weczerka, Marburg 1995, Verlag Herder Institut, 210 pp.

The volume under discussion is a collection of studies, for the most part already presented at the Conference organized by Marburg University and Herder Institute in Marburg. The remaining ones (K. Böhm, B. Wachowiak, J. Mattek) have been prepared especially for this publication. The mentioned articles concern mostly the problems of estates in Central-Eastern Europe, there are, however, exceptions from this rule. Thus Ferdinand Seibt's study is devoted to the position of rulers and estates in Central-Western Europe (the

area between Riviera and the North Sea). Seibt thinks this area can be compared to Central–Eastern Europe, because of such characteristics as: multilinguality of the countries under discussion, the bridging–role that they played in the transfer of culture and finally the presence of trade–centres of similar significance. In both zones there were many bilingual towns, across both of them the transfer of German civil–law proceeded from the Reich. A strong position of estates in relation to the rulers is considered by the author to be their distinctive feature. He perceives it in the status of the ecclesiastical princes of the Reich, and compares the situation of the rulers of Brabant, Gelderland, Lorraine, Savoy, Flanders and Luxembourg to the position of Polish, Hungarian and Bohemian magnates. He also perceives an important political role of local estates in particular countries. However, he admits that towards the close of the Middle Ages in no countries of Central–Western Europe were estates as strong as in Poland, Bohemia and Hungary.

Also Klaus Richard Böhme's study goes beyond Central–Eastern Europe. The author presents the history of Swedish estates. In his opinion the growth of estate rights resulted from quarrels within the Vasa family in the 1560s and at the turn of the 16th c., as well as from the weakness of royal power during the minority of Gustavus Adolphus and Christine. Sharp rivalry between the gentry, the peasants and the burghers on the one hand and the nobility on the other led in its turn to the downfall of the significance of the estates and to the introduction of absolutism by Charles XI.

Finally there is Günther Stöckl's study, which according to the author's design was to be devoted to the problem of the estate system in early modern Russia. In fact the author focussed on Central Europe on the basis of articles by G. Schramm and J. Macek, devoting little space to the Russian estates. Following the assertions of Klaus Zernack he perceives land assemblies as well as the Russian Parliament, the so–called *Ziemijski Sobor* as institutions similar to the estate assemblies in Europe.

The problems of the political structure of the states in Central–Eastern Europe have been introduced by K. Zernack. He presented the estate systems of Poland, Bohemia and Hungary, showing their mutual similarities and ways of development. The specificity of the latter was, according to the author, determined by: the adoption of Christianity according to the Latin rite, German and Jewish settlements, endowing the whole region with an original multiethnic colour, the political expansion of Poland and Hungary, and finally the movement of settlers within the newly–established states and within their spheres of influence. In Poland, Bohemia and Hungary a new type of nation as well as republic of the gentry were emerging. These states, especially Poland and Hungary should be ranked alongside England, the Netherlands, Sweden, Venice, Genoa and Switzerland with the republican family of European nations. They had defended themselves against internal absolutism, however in the course of time they surrendered to the imperial powers. In the author's opinion the division of Europe into conservative–imperial and liberal–democratic states began in 1526, after the invasion of Bohemia and part of Hungary by the Habsburgs. Moreover, the roads to a modern state led not only through modernization imposed from above in absolutist states, or through its opposite — the reforms of the French Revolution, but also through the estate system of the republics of the gentry.

Only one article has been devoted to the problem of Poland. Michael G. Müller has presented the evolution of the views of Polish historiography on the Polish Commonwealth, concentrating on the question of gentry democracy and magnate oligarchy in the 16th and 17th cc. In an interesting analysis he takes a stand on the views of several Polish historians (A. Wyczański, A. Lityński, H. Olszewski and J. Staszewski). At present, he emphasizes, one cannot speak of the magnate oligarchy before 1668, the whole phenomenon must be perceived in the right proportion. There was no oligarchic rule in Poland, the Sejm that was not working was replaced not by the magnates but by the Councils of the Senate. He perceives, after J. Staszewski, the alliance of enlightened magnates with the Royal Court, characteristic of the reign of the Wettins and the beginning of the reign of Stanislaus Augustus Poniatowski. It must be admitted that the author is not only well–informed about the views of Polish historians, but also shows a profound understanding of the historical process in Poland.

Two other articles are only partly connected with Polish problems. The first one, written by Heinz von zur Mühlen, is devoted to the autonomy and self-government of the estates in the territory of the former Livonian State of the Order of the Knights of the Sword. Another, by Janusz Małek discusses the reasons why Königsberg adhered to the fealty of Prussia to the Polish Commonwealth in the years 1525–1701. As for Livonia, before secularization it formed a confederacy of various territories with one, three-curia Parliament. The confederacy, apart from the lands subjected to the Order, was made up of the territories of the Riga archbishopric, Dorpat, Ösel and Courland bishoprics. The author shows us how Livonia changed masters, beginning with the 1560s up to 1721. He points to the consequences of this process. Estonia enjoyed the most stability, remaining almost permanently in the hands of the Swedes; the rights of its estates were generally respected. Livonia, won by Swedes from Poland in the 1620s, was treated quite differently. The limitation of its estate liberties had led to a rebellion which facilitated the subjugation of this territory by Peter I. Of great interest is the information about the structure of the Estonian Parliament and the function of the representation of the estates in Swedish Livonia after 1629. One feels a lack of reference to Courland and the so-called Polish Livonia after 1629.

Bohemia is the country, whose history has been given most attention in this set of articles. As many as three papers have been devoted to it. In the first one Josef Valka presented the process of mental transformation within the estates by citing Moravia. In the author's opinion the structure of the states of Bohemian Crown favoured the persistence of the concepts of fealty, especially in Bohemia itself. While the estates of Moravia and Silesia throughout the 16th c. concentrated on emphasizing their independence from Bohemia. The situation changed only on the eve of the Thirty Years' War. The sense of community of shared interest got the upper hand. This process was crowned by the establishment of a confederacy of estates of all the Bohemian countries and a common diet for the whole kingdom, in 1619. The article as a whole is not quite convincing.

Winfried Eberhard has presented the relations of power between the Bohemian estates and the ruler in the context of the religious question. In his opinion the denominational opposition between the estates and kings of Bohemia strengthened the autonomy of the estates. Under the influence of the Habsburg's repressive politics a rapprochement took place between the utraquists, Lutherans and Bohemian Brethren. In 1575 the so-called *Confesio Bohemica* arose. In the author's opinion, if the Royal Court had not favoured excessively the Catholic minority, there would have been a chance in Bohemia to establish a confederacy of estates based on denominational and national pluralism. In Moravia, on the other hand, there was complete religious liberty right up to the repressions that followed the battle of the White Mountain. Although this fact did not lead to the co-operation of non-Catholic denominations, nevertheless it helped to build solidarity between the estates. The price the estates had to pay for religious toleration was their extreme loyalty towards the Habsburg dynasty. The author emphasizes that only the reforms of Joseph II put an end to the majority of privileges enjoyed in Bohemia by the estates.

Inge Auerbach in her interesting study analyzes the reform projects proposed by the Bohemian estates in the years 1606–1609, i.e. during the quarrels within the Habsburg family. The estates of the Bohemian Crown tried to take advantage of this feud not only to restore their former significance but also to extend their privileges. Because of Bohemia's striving for hegemony over the remaining countries of the kingdom the actions taken by the estates were not co-ordinated, moreover, sometimes even contradictory. In the author's opinion the political elites of Bohemian countries were characterized by a sense of citizenship modelled on the virtues of the ancient Roman Republic. This sense was the strongest in Poland, which was an attractive model for the members of the estates of the Bohemian Kingdom. Vaclav Kinsky's project of 1609 includes among other things a postulate to deprive the king of the right of appointing country officials and to transfer this right on the diet. Here one can hardly overlook the analogy with the postulates of Polish rebels in 1606 and 1607. According to Kinsky, the ministers should be responsible to the diet while the diet itself should have legal initiative and constitute the supreme judicial body. A General Diet would be assembled every three years, one for all the lands of the kingdom. Characteristically, this postulate was rejected

by Bohemians, Moravians and Silesians alike. The author thinks that in 1610 the Bohemian gentry, coming out against the estate of lords in the diet, wanted to introduce the principle of equality of the gentry based on the Polish model. Also the Moravian estates wanted to introduce many changes on the Polish model. These efforts were however unsuccessful.

Norbert Conrads devoted his article to the analysis of the estate-representative system in Silesia. He presented the historical origin of the isolation of Silesia from Poland and the process of feudal disintegration. The estate system of Silesia with its three-curia diet and a system of local diets, according to the author resembled the structure of the German Parliament *Reichstag*. At the same time the high complication of the estate system assuaged the conflicts between the monarchy and Silesian estates.

Hungarian problems of the 18th c. and the first half of the 19th c. have been discussed in the article by Wolfgang Kessler. The author presents the estate structure of the Hungarian Kingdom and the countries that belonged to it (Croatia, Transylvania). Politically the Hungarian nation was made up of the magnates, the gentry, prelates and in Transylvania also of the Szekelies. Slowly the nation started to embrace other social strata, among others, at the beginning of the 19th c., the intelligentsia. The author thinks that Hungarians and Croats constitute an example of the evolutionary rise of a modern nation from estate structures, without the intermediary stage in the form of an absolutist system and revolution. The Hungarian estates sustained their special political position until 1848.

Other articles concern the Pomeranian and East-Prussian problems. Bogdan Wachowiak has shown the position of the estates during the reign of the Grifft dynasty (until 1637). Stefan Hartmann's article is devoted to the homage paid by the estates of Eastern Prussia to the new King Frederick II. The analysis of gravamens presented by the Prussian estates to the ruler shows, according to the author, that the estates did not reconcile themselves to the limitations of their rights and tried to recover their lost political position. These endeavours were, however, unsuccessful.

The set of studies under discussion is interesting above all because they take a comparative approach to the problems of estate society in Central-Eastern Europe. And although few articles make direct comparisons (most emphatic in that by Inge Auerbach), yet the juxtaposition itself of those problems in Central-European countries constitutes a new investigative quality. It is also very interesting to know the German view on the problems of Polish historiography. It is worth underlining that German historians (Zernack, Eberhard, Kessler) perceive the estate society of Central-Eastern Europe as an alternative to the absolute monarchy. In contradistinction to them, many of their Polish colleagues are determined to detect in the estate society the causes of partitions and from this standpoint deplore the fact that Poland did not live to see the absolutist system. It should be regretted that despite the declaration about the prominent position of Poland and Hungary and the influence they exerted on the surrounding countries, little attention has been devoted to them. The conference was dominated by the countries connected to the German cultural and political zone.

Edward Opaliński

Überlieferung und Kritik: zwanzig Jahre Barockforschung in der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel, Wolfenbütteler Arbeiten zur Barockforschung, Bd. 21, Wiesbaden 1993, Harrassowitz Verlag, 263 Seiten.

Am 29. Februar 1992, nach 24 Jahren des Leitens der historischen Bücherei, trennte sich von ihr und ging in den Ruhestand ein Mensch, der wie selten jemand — in einer allerdings vorteilhaften Konjunktur des nicht nur wirtschaftlichen Wiederaufbaus der BRD — imstande war, daraus ein weltbekanntes wissenschaftliches Institut mit einer hervorragenden Basis in Form von Sammlungen zu machen. Als Paul Raabe die Tätigkeit in Wolfenbüttel aufnahm, dauerten dort Überholungsarbeiten in dessen Hauptsitz (Bibliotheca Augusta) an, renoviert wurde das mehrere Jahrhunderte zählende Lessingshaus (heute ist es Sitz eines Museums des Bibliothekars — Dichters), erst in Zukunft sollten weitere Gebäude der Bestimmung übergeben werden, darunter das Zeughaus, ohne das man sich das Funktionieren der Herzog

Bibliothek nur schwer vorstellen könnte. Begleitet wurde Paul Raabe von mehreren Mitarbeitern, gewagt gibt es ihrer etwa zweihundert und jeder von ihnen erhielt an dem erwähnten Tag von dem Direktor mit namentlicher Widmung sein Tagebuch aus jenen Jahren mit dem überraschenden Titel *Bibliosibirsk oder mitten in Deutschland. Jahre in Wolfenbüttel* (Zürich 1992), in dem er auf fast 400 Seiten die Entwicklung der Institution von den ersten Nachkriegsjahren schildert, oft übrigens in die ferne Vergangenheit zurückblickend, besonders ins 17. Jh. Auf S. 97 erinnert er an seine, am 1. April 1975 anlässlich der Inauguration des Forschungsprogramms geäußerten Worte: Er bezeichnete damals Wolfenbüttel als die "Hauptstadt der Barock-Literatur". An anderer Stelle, drei Jahre früher, nannte er die Bibliothek "das achte Weltwunder" ("Wolfenbütteler Beiträge", 1, 1972, S. 3).

Es gab in diesen Worten keinerlei Exaltation, sie waren lediglich eine Veräußerung der Vision, die er unter der Schirmherrschaft der Landesregierung Niedersachsens konsequent realisieren sollte. Es entstanden weitere Bauwerke — von Grund auf errichtet, oder auch, wie das Zeughaus, im Inneren gründlich an die neue Bestimmung angepaßt. In der Nähe wurde ein Schloß aus dem 16. Jh. renoviert, das früher, besonders nach feindlichen Überfällen, immer wieder erneut in seiner alten Pracht wiederhergestellt wurde. Noch in der ersten Hälfte dieses Jahrhunderts in Verfall geraten, verschiedenen Zwecken dienend, wurde es nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg restauriert. Heute kann man sich ohne das Schloß, obwohl es formal dem HAB-Komplex nicht angehört, die Herzog August Bibliothek auch kaum vorstellen. Die Bibliothek bildet übrigens einen integralen Teil der barocken Stadt oder zumindest einer Stadt, die an die Zeiten des erwähnten Herrschers erinnert. Auch in dieser Hinsicht spielte eine beachtliche Rolle P. Raabe, Autor der Abhandlung: *Der alten Stadt eine Zukunft. Wolfenbüttel als Beispiel* (1975).

Im Zuge der Erweiterung der räumlichen Basis, der Ausbildung eines Kaders und der Erzielung von Mitarbeitern aus Europa, wie auch aus anderen Kontinenten, entstanden dank der dynamischen Wissenschaftlichen Abteilung, die von Anfang an 1975 bis 1997 von Dr. Sabine Solf geleitet wurde, in ihrem Schwung imposante Verlagsserien (Aufmerksamkeit verdient die feste Verbindung mit dem für seine luxuriösen Katalogeditionen bekannten Sauer-Verlag aus München und dem hervorragenden Verlagshaus wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen, der Firma Harrassowitz aus Wiesbaden sowie dem lokalen Jacobi-Verlag). Die Wissenschaftliche Abteilung wurde in dem Augenblick organisiert, als dank verschiedener Stiftungen die materielle Forschungsbasis abgesichert wurde, die bis heute vor allem in drei Richtungen entwickelt werden: 1) Geschichte des Buches, 2) Barock, 3) das 18. Jh. mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Kultur und Literatur der Region Braunschweig — Wolfenbüttel. Zu vermerken ist, daß die HAB, die unter der besonderen Betreuung der Behörden Niedersachsens steht, zugleich die zentrale nationale Bücherei dieses Bundeslandes ist. Im Rahmen der organisierten Sammlung deutscher Drucke 1450–1912 wiederum (seit 1912 führt den Register die Deutsche Bücherei in Leipzig) wurden der HAB die Jahre 1601–1700 "zugeteilt"; die Inkunabelregister wurden der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München anvertraut, das 18. Jh. — der Niedersächsischen Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek in Göttingen, die Jahre 1801–1870 — der Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek in Frankfurt/Main, und die Jahre 1871–1912 — der Staatsbibliothek in Berlin.

Die Gruppe, die sich mit den Barockforschungen befaßt, entstand 1972, ihre Arbeiten leitet ein internationales Komitee, das aus Vertretern von 14 Zentren aus Deutschland, Italien, Holland, Belgien, England und den USA besteht. Eine aktive Tätigkeit entwickelten hier auch die Polen Marian Szyrocki (gest. 1992) und Elida Maria Szarota. Die letztere gehörte bis zum Tode (1994) dem von Paul Raabe geleiteten Ehrenkomitee an. Kein Wunder, daß dieses ausgesprochen internationale Team nach zwanzig Jahren — an seiner Spitze steht derzeit Martin Bircher, ein schweizerischer Gelehrter, der eine Zeitlang mit Ottawa verbunden war und heute in Wolfenbüttel tätig ist; seine Mitarbeiterin ist die aus Großbritannien hierhergekommene Gillian Bepler — sich der Mühe unterziehen konnte, einen Bericht in Form eines umfangreichen, mit Fakten gesättigten Buches zu bearbeiten, das luxuriös, mit wahrhaft barockem Geschmack, reich illustriert veröffentlicht wurde. Es erhielt den allerdings bescheidenen Titel: *Überlieferung und Kritik*, etwas mehr sagt der Untertitel aus: *Zwanzig Jahre Barockforschung in der HAB*. Das Buch erschien als 21. Band der dieser Epoche gewidmeten

Arbeiten. Der Band unterscheidet sich jedoch von anderen durch sein Format und seinen albummäßigen — aber nicht konventionellen, jubiläumsbedingten — Charakter.

Überlieferung und Kritik erschien in der Zeit des Interregnums, als der bereits mehrmals erwähnte Schöpfer der modernen Herzog August Bibliothek seinen Direktorposten verlassen und sein Nachfolger Helwig Schmidt-Glitzter das Steuer noch nicht übernommen hatte. So versahen also das Werk mit Vorworten Georg Ruppelt — Chef der Bibliothek und Sabine Solf. Mit Zahlen arbeitend (Sammlungen, Editionen, Forschungsprogramm), machten sie auf den Platz der Barockzeit in Geschichte und Gegenwart Wolfenbüttels aufmerksam. Die von ihnen stichwortartig angegebenen Fragen entwickelte Martin Bircher in dem den Leistungen der vergangenen zwanzig Jahre gewidmeten Studium *Sammlungen — Zugänglichmachung — Forschungen* (S. 11–42). Er erfaßte dort komplex die Fragen, die im weiteren eingehend im Rahmen der drei Teile: *Sammlungen und Neuanschaffungen* (S. 43–96), *Katalogisierung und Zugänglichmachung* (S. 97–130) und *Forschungen* (S. 131–252) besprochen werden. Die Proportionen in der Verteilung des Materials beweisen, wie viel die Autoren über die Errungenschaften der Forschungen zu sagen hatten.

Die aristokratischen Bibliotheken aus dem 16.–18. Jh. erhielten sich äußerst selten an Ort und Stelle, und schon ganz ausnahmsweise ohne Schäden, verursacht durch Schicksalsschläge (Kriege und andere Kataklysmen) oder auch von Erben aufgeteilt, bzw. verkauft. Die herzoglichen Sammlungen aus Wolfenbüttel waren in einer glücklicheren Situation; sie waren keiner Bedrohung ausgesetzt, auch dann nicht, als sie von der Herzogsfamilie nicht mehr betreut wurden und unter den Schutz der Gemeinschaft gerieten. Vielleicht nur eins: an der Schwelle der Zwischenkriegszeit tauchte der Entwurf auf, zu ihrem Schutzherrn G. E. Lessing zu machen, der aber nicht angenommen wurde. Die Bibliothek blieb in ihrem Namen fest mit dem barocken Gründer verbunden. Im Augenblick seines Todes (1656) zählte sie bereits 135 000 Werke, die der Herrscher selbst katalogisierte; er erwarb sie in ganz Europa über die Vermittlung kompetenter Agenten. Zur Zeit stammen aus dem 17. Jh. 150 000 Volumina.

Den bibliophilen Interessen war eine bereits 1972 organisierte Ausstellung gewidmet, die dank eines in Albumform veröffentlichten Katalogs überdauert hat. Ausstellungen bilden eine der Hauptrichtungen der Tätigkeit der HAB im Bereich des Zugänglichmachens, sie werden immer in der erwähnten Form verewigt. Manchmal sind mehr als ein Band nötig, wie im Falle der Dokumentation der Reise Lessings nach Italien; hier wurde der Katalog zuerst in italienischer Fassung veröffentlicht, dann in der deutschen. Auf das 17. Jh. bezog sich ein beachtlicher Teil von den 70 Ausstellungen, darunter die mit ungewöhnlichem Schwung organisierte Exposition zum Thema des Schutzherrn der Bibliothek anlässlich seines 400. Geburtstags (1979). Die Exposition ging über das Gelände der Bibliothek hinaus — ein Teil der Sammlungen wurde in natürlicher Szenerie präsentiert — im Schloß; mit einbezogen wurde auch die Stätte der ewigen Ruhe von August dem Jüngeren in der Hauptkrypta der Marienkirche.

M. Bircher ist in dem schließlich umfangreichen synthetischen Abriß, von einer Würdigung des Schutzherrn ausgehend (er beginnt mit der Anknüpfung an seine Devise, die in der Bibliotheca Augusta zu lesen ist: *Deo et posteritati*), lediglich imstande, die Hauptrichtungen der Forschungen zu signalisieren, oft verweist er den Leser auf eigene Berichte und andere Texte, die in den seit 1974 erscheinenden "Wolfenbütteler Nachrichten" veröffentlicht wurden; er vergißt auch die wertvollsten Denkmäler nicht, die aus anderen Epochen stammen, wie den Stolz Niedersachsens, das mittelalterliche Evangeliarium von Heinrich dem Löwen, dessen Erwerb in einer Londoner Versteigerung mit Unterstützung der ganzen BRD der Autor von *Bibliobirsk* viel Platz eingeräumt hat. Er faßt das zusammen, womit sich in weiterer Reihenfolge andere Autoren der eingehenderen Arbeiten über das "Mekka der Barockforschung" beschäftigen. Besondere Aufmerksamkeit lenkt er auf Katalogarbeiten, Flugblätter, Gelegenheitsdrucke, Begräbnispredigten, Sammlungen von Porträts, Korrespondenz, Materialien zur Geschichte der Herzogsfamilie. Die Überlegungen schließt eine Reflexion über die Forschungspläne ab, die realen und die erwünschten.

Der erfahrene Kenner der HAB-Sammlungen Wolfgang Milde leitet den Zyklus der Arbeiten über die Sammlungen mit einer Analyse der Tagebuchmaterialien ein, indem er sie

auf dem Hintergrund der Literatur des 16.–18. Jh. vorführt. Es ist keine abgeschlossene Kollektion, sie wird ständig durch Neuerwerbungen bereichert. Der Autor fügte dem Text eine Zusammenstellung von 14 besonders interessanten Texten aus dem 16. und von 46 Texten aus dem 17. Jh. bei. Auf die Handschriften in allgemeiner Sicht beziehen sich die Überlegungen von Wolf-Dieter Otte; die Kollektion selbst zählt etwa 12 000 Exemplare aus verschiedenen Komplexen, u. a. der Postuniversitätssammlung aus Helmstedt (Anfang des 17. Jh. befand sich dort die Bibliotheca Julia, um nach zwei Jahrhunderten zurückzukehren, bereichert um den Nachlaß der aufgelösten Hochschule); es sind Materialien, die sich vor allem auf verschiedene Lebensbereiche im alten Deutschland auswirkten. Werner Arnold präsentierte etwa 150 000 Drucke aus dem 17. Jh. und machte vor allem auf die Reformationsproblematik aufmerksam, besonders wie sie von den einzelnen Herzögen betrachtet wurde, neben der Theologie betonte er die Bedeutung solcher Bereiche wie die Philosophie, die Geschichte, die Politik, die Rechtswissenschaft und die Philologie. Die Gegenwart und ihre Fragen (die heutige Politologie) zwang die Herrscher aus praktischen Gründen, über Buchhändler und Hofleute Neuigkeiten in deutschen Ländern und außerhalb der Grenzen des Reiches zu erwerben. Sie blieben nicht tot, sondern funktionierten, sofort in den Katalog eingeführt. Je 40% bildeten lateinische und deutsche Drucke, 10% — französische, nicht so zahlreich waren italienische (etwa 5%) und englische (weniger als 1%). Bemerkungen über die Bearbeitung und besonders über die veröffentlichten Kataloge entwickelten weitere Autoren: Petra Feuerstein (Sammlung deutscher Dokumente 1601–1700) und Thomas Bürger (*Katalog der deutschen Drucke des Barock 1600–1720, Ungarische Drucke und Hungarica 1480–1720; Polnische Drucke und Polonica 1501–1700*). Beide konnten nicht nur das Forschungsprogramm vorlegen, sondern auch dessen Realisierung in Form von einigen zehn stattlichen Katalogen, veröffentlicht in der Firma Sauer (München), wo in der gleichen Form eine Porträtssammlung aus der IAB zugänglich gemacht wurde (ihre Vorführung durch Peter Mortzfeld leitet den zweiten Teil der Studien ein; *nota bene* scheint die Einteilung zwischen ihm und dem vorigen Teil vollkommen unscharf zu sein).

Besondere Aufmerksamkeit verdient der im Umfang kleine Artikel von Marina Arnold *Begrüßungsreden in den IAB-Sammlungen* (S. 105–112). Sie waren — ähnlich wie in Polen — dem Gedenken sowohl an die Machthaber, als auch dem reichen Adel und der städtischen Aristokratie gewidmet und in 100–500 Exemplaren veröffentlicht. In Wolfenbüttel versammelte man ihrer etwa 14 000, hauptsächlich aus dem 17. Jh., es ist also eine durchaus stattliche Sammlung. Die Autorin charakterisiert ihre Provenienz, verweist auf den führenden Platz unter ähnlichen Sammlungen in den Bibliotheken der BRD. Eine nützliche Ergänzung des Textes bilden ausgebaute Anmerkungen, die auf mitunter schwer zugängliche westliche Publikationen verweisen. Erdmann Weyrauch skizzierte ein „Marginalium juridicum“, Peter Pfeiffer dagegen schilderte eingehend den Entwurf der Computerisierung der Sammlungen aus dem 17. Jh. Diese Form der wissenschaftlichen Information wird wahrscheinlich die gegenwärtigen ausgebauten, aber auch viel Platz beanspruchenden Kataloge einnehmen; am Rande drängt sich die Beobachtung auf, daß es sich gut fügt, daß man neben dem großen Katalog der Drucke des deutschen Barocks imstande war, die Hungarica und — für das 16. sowie 17. Jh. — Polonica herauszugeben. Das 18. Jh. wird wohl bereits in anderer Form erscheinen, vielleicht wird aber das Krakauer Team aus der Jagiellonen-Bibliothek den Wettlauf mit der Zeit gewinnen und die erschienenen fünf Bände um einige weitere bereichern.

Im dritten Teil wurden die Forschungsergebnisse der vergangenen zwanzig Jahre besprochen. Die wichtigsten hängen mit dem im Augenblick der Vorbereitung des Buches ein ähnliches Jubiläum feiernden Arbeitskreis für Barockforschung zusammen, dessen Tätigkeit der hier besonders kompetente M. Bircher vorführte. Er machte darauf aufmerksam, daß man im Jahre 1978 von der Bezeichnung „deutsche“ Barockliteratur abging und den Studien einen universellen Charakter verlieh. Auf den Forschungsbeitrag aus verschiedenen Ländern verweisend, nannte er die beiden obengenannten polnischen Namen (Szarota–Szyrocki). Er brief sich auch jetzt auf die „Wolfenbütteler Barock-Nachrichten“, auf die Kataloge, auf die organisierten Konferenzen und Kongresse, und verwies die Leser auf den nächsten Text, mit einem durchaus dokumentarischen Charakter (Barbara Strotz, *Zwanzig Jahre Barockbibliographie*), wie auch auf einen weiteren Text, der die wissenschaftlichen, mit dem 17. Jh.

verbundenen Veranstaltungen registriert (Friedrich Niewöhner). Die sorgfältige Zusammenstellung umfaßt 187 Symposien, Seminare, Kurse und andere Sitzungen, was — wie leicht zu bemerken ist — die imposante Zahl von zehn im Laufe eines Jahres ergibt. Sie waren fruchtbringend in Form von individuellen und kollektiven Veröffentlichungen. Im weiteren antizipierte Gillian Bepler mit einer synthetischen Einleitung die Zusammenstellung der Namen (samt den Themen der vorbereiteten Arbeiten) von über zweihundert Forschern mit in die Wissenschaft eingegangenen Namen (wie Robert Mandrou) und der Vertreter der jüngeren Generation, denen die HAB den Aufenthalt in Wolfenbüttel absicherte. So mancher von ihnen veröffentlichte eine Reihe von Abhandlungen in Anlehnung an die Sammlungen der Bibliothek, wir stoßen hier u.a. auf Autoren von Katalogen der Polonica und Hungarica. Typisch war der Aufenthalt im Laufe des Jahres von etwa 50 Wissenschaftlern aus verschiedenen Ländern.

Die Übersicht der Forschungen schließen Beiträge über die Veröffentlichung von Briefen der Deutschen Akademie im 17. Jh. ab sowie eine Zusammenstellung der mit diesem Jahrhundert verbundenen Veröffentlichungen. Die Bewegung im Dickicht der Namen, Zusammenstellungen, Titeln der Arbeiten erleichtert der Personenindex. Es ist gut, daß die HAB Wolfenbüttel mit der hier besprochenen Edition ihre einmaligen Errungenschaften in der Annäherung der Fragen des europäischen Barocks der Wissenschaft gefestigt hat.

Marceli Kosman

Karolina Targosz, *Sawantki w Polsce w XVII w. Aspiracje intelektualne kobiet ze środowisk dworskich (Bluestockings in 17th Century Poland. The Intellectual Aspirations of Women of Royal Court Circles)*, Warszawa 1997, Wyd. Retro-Art, 534 pp., illus., Rozprawy z dziejów Nauki i Techniki, Volume 6, Komitet Historii Nauki i Techniki Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

Several books devoted to the history of women in the modern era have appeared in Poland recently, among them biographies by J. Seredyka¹, M. Komaszynski², and B. Popiołek³. The book under review belongs to the current of "feminist" research but, unlike the above-mentioned studies, it does not portray a single figure but a group of persons: the royal court circles in the 17th century⁴. Two queens, Marie-Louise and Marie-Casimire come, of course, to the fore, but the subject-matter of the book is much broader. The author also takes an interest in at least several dozen women connected with the two queens and their courts more or less closely. The subtitle of the book, *The Intellectual Aspirations of Women of Royal Court Circles*, restricts the range of the author's interest, but in practice she repeatedly oversteps these limits and deals with women's political and economic activity and their position in the family and marriage. The book consists of a *Foreword*, an *Introduction*, six chapters, a *Conclusion*, a chronological list of sources (there is no bibliography), nine genealogical tables, a summary in French and an index of persons.

As the author herself says, her aim was to examine and present the cultural and intellectual aspirations of Poland's two French queens and the ladies and maids they brought with them from France. According to Targosz, they transferred to Poland the intellectual emancipation trends which were spreading among the French elites in the 17th century. The book deals mainly with the 1646–1696 period, that is, the years from the arrival of Marie-Louise in Poland until the end of Marie Casimire's reign.

¹ J. Seredyka, *Książniczka i chudopacholek. Zofia z Radziwiłłów Drohojajska — Stanisław Tymiński (The Princess and the Petty Nobleman. Zofia Drohojajska, née Radziwiłł — Stanisław Tymiński)*, Opole 1995.

² M. Komaszynski, *Piękna królowa Maria Kazimiera d'Arquien-Sobieska (The Beautiful Queen Marie-Casimire d'Arquien-Sobieska)*, Kraków 1995.

³ B. Popiołek, *Królowa bez korony. Studium z życia i działalności Elżbiety z Lubomirskich Sieniawskiej, ok. 1669–1729 (The Queen Without Crown. A Study in the Life and Activity of Elżbieta Sieniawska, née Lubomirska, about 1669–1729)*, Kmków 1996.

⁴ A group portrait of women leading a cloistered life is presented in M. Borkowska's book *Życie codzienne polskich klasztorów żeńskich w XVII–XVIII w. (Everyday Life in Polish Nunneries in the 17th and 18th Centuries)*, Warszawa 1996.

The author precedes her reflections by an *Introduction* (pp. 15–39) in which she briefly outlines what she calls “feminist intellectual aspirations” throughout centuries, paying special attention to the 16th century, this being the period which directly preceded the epoch presented in the book. Targosz concentrates her attention on French and Polish circles; it is a pity that she has ignored Germany and Britain whose rich literature on the subject in question would have provided interesting material for comparisons. It is amazing that the author pays no attention to the influence which the Reformation exerted on the situation of women and their opportunities for intellectual development; this is a highly controversial question which has attracted the attention of many researchers who, especially in the last few years, have examined the position of women in Protestant and Catholic families and the influence of the decision to dissolve or maintain convents, that alternative way of life.

The first chapter (pp. 40–120) portrays the courts of the two queens by means of individual biographies. It presents the most important facts from the lives of Marie–Louise and Marie–Casimire, members of their suites and ladies loosely linked to the royal court. From frequently very fragmentary sources and scraps of information the author tries to reconstruct the intellectual atmosphere and feminist aspirations of this milieu. This *galerie de dames* offers the reader a large stock of information which will also be useful to future researchers into the women’s world. Chapter II (pp. 121–171) entitled *Old and New Horizons—from the Wedding to the End of One’s Days* presents reflections which though interesting, are on the fringe of the main subject of the book. The reader will find here a lot of information on the ceremonial accompanying important events (not only in women’s life), such as engagements, weddings and funerals, data on feminine features in the architecture of palaces and magnatial residences and women’s society life in them; we also learn about changes in fashions and only then does the author present very important reflections on the political activity of the two queens and ladies from their circle; several pages deal with women’s increased mobility in the 17th century (travels of various kind). The fact that the author has combined such disparate subjects in one chapter has detracted from the lucidity of her message.

Chapter III (pp. 172–244), *With a Book in Hand—Reading Matter for Women and Books on Women*, also deals with two different questions. The first is the education of women and the reading matter at their disposal in the 17th century; the other question is the various lexicons and “galleries” of famous ladies published at that time not only in France but also in Germany and England; they presented opinions on women’s erudition and their ability to act in the public field, outside home. It would have been better to separate these two questions. Nevertheless, the chapter contains a great deal of interesting information, e.g. on the knowledge of foreign languages among court ladies and the methods and level of girls’ education. Much space has been devoted to the theatre, a subject which, in my opinion, deserves a separate consideration.

Chapter IV (pp. 245–319), *With the Pen in Hand—From Letters to Autobiographies*, is more compact as regards its subject–matter. It raises the very important question of women’s penmanship; the author does not confine herself to an analysis of Queen Marie–Casimire’s abundant but well known correspondence, but also examines other ladies’ letters from the archives of the Radziwiłłs, Denhoffs, Zamoyskis and other prominent families, as well as little “Chronicles” written by women; she ends with an extensive analysis of Anna Zbąska’s spine–chilling diary. The chapter also contains an important remark, an instruction for future researchers: the author points out that it is necessary to research monastic archives and examine nuns’ autobiographies and chronicles of female orders, which abounded in the 17th century, for it was in convents that women most often reached for the pen.

Chapter V (pp. 320–391), *Woman and Child—Between Medicals and Experienced Women*, deals with such specifically feminine questions as maternity and care of small children against the background of 17th century gynecology and pediatrics. The title of the chapter narrows the question, for in the 17th century women performed much wider medical tasks; they were home physicians who looked after sick persons of all ages, making use of the centuries–long experience of folk medicine. Targosz cites very interesting opinions of contemporaries (including the opinion of John Sobieski) which show that in those days people distrusted “learned doctors” and had confidence in the skill of experienced women. The chapter

presents 17th century ladies both as patients and physicians' protectors, and shows that as they grew older they became skilled in medicine and endeavoured to bring relief to themselves and members of their family.

Chapter VI (pp. 392–460), *Protectors, Devotees and Votaries of Astronomy*, presents women interested in astronomy and acting as patrons in this field. Targosz pays special attention to women—astronomers in Gdańsk and Silesia who studied stars and maintained contacts with the Polish royal court. The extensive life stories of Hevelius's two wives as well as of Maria Cunitia firmly confirm the opinions of many researchers that in the 17th century women could distinguish themselves in science (also in the arts) only if they had the proper family background, when their father or husband was both tolerant and interested in the same field of knowledge. This resembled the situation in guilds, where wives and daughters participated in production and were given vocational training in the family. An independent scientific career was out of women's reach.

The *Conclusion* (pp. 461–476) is an interesting presentation of links between Poland and women in Poland with women scientists and famous women in 17th century Europe. The author speaks of the French woman Marie le Jars de Gournay, Anna Maria van Schurmann from the Netherlands, Princess Elizabeth of the Palatinate, the Swedish Queen Christina, and Elena Cornaro Piscipia from Italy (the first female doctor of philosophy at the University of Padua). She says that these links testify to the high level of the Polish women's intellectual movement.

Karolina Targosz's book, based on large-scale research also in foreign archives, supplies the reader with many valuable data. Its shortcoming is that as regards comparisons, it concentrates too much on France, but this is due mainly to the French descent and French connections of the two queens who are the principal heroines, although there are many other female figures in the book. Scholars interested in the situation of women in the old Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth have been offered a book which gives food for thought and is an inspiration to further research.

Maria Bogucka

Małgorzata Borkowska, *Życie codzienne polskich klasztorów żeńskich w XVII–XVIII wieku (Everyday Life in Polish Convents in the 17th and 18th Centuries)*, Warszawa 1996, PIW, 376 pp., illus.

For several dozen years we have been witnessing a development of research into the history of women, that half, or even a larger part, of mankind which was previously neglected by scholars. This neglect was due to researchers' predilection for history of events, for political history, in which men once played the main role while women put in a rare, exceptional appearance. The existence of women was woven into "processes of long duration", into what was regarded as trivial ordinary life, and was therefore ignored by scholars. It aroused broader interest only when these "processes of long duration", ordinariness and the way of life of broad masses, became subjects of scholarly investigation, pushing great events and political perturbations into the background. Hundreds of books and studies discussing various aspects of the history of women or rather the history of the relationship between the genders (known as gender studies) appear every year in the United States, Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Holland and the Scandinavian countries. This kind of research is still weakly developed in Poland for Polish scholars have focused attention on the Middle Ages and the 19th and 20th centuries. The modern era is poorly represented (although some studies dealing with this period have appeared recently). The book under review is therefore most valuable for it takes up an important subject which has received insufficient attention.

The value of the book is enhanced by its specific subject-matter: life in nunneries. A discussion has been going on for years on the role of the Reformation and its influence on the situation of women on the threshold of the modern era, that is, in the 16th–18th centuries. At first the opinion prevailed that the Reformation exerted a favourable influence on the status and opportunities of women for it gave them wide access to elementary education (literacy was being rapidly disseminated in Protestant countries in order to enable people to read the

Bible), liberated women from dependence on the male clergy (e.g. from the influence of confessors), and raised married life to the rank of the highest virtue. However, critical opinions were soon raised (this current was initiated by Lyndal Roper's famous book *The Holy Household. Women and Morals in Reformation Augsburg*, Oxford 1989), and grew in number as detailed research developed. These critical studies have shown the reverse of the medal, the fact that the family was shaped on extremely patriarchal principles under which the husband (father) was God's only representative, the law maker and absolute ruler over the wife and children, a ruler from whose decisions there was no appeal. Within the framework of this interesting discussion there developed a dispute over the role of monasteries which, as is well known, were dissolved in the Protestant states but flourished in the Catholic countries, e.g. in Poland (*nota bene* convent-like congregations of widows and other single women survived in many Protestant countries in response to social demand). A heated dispute arose over nunneries; some scholars have asserted that nunneries were places of oppression and abuse in which, at the request of the family (father, brother), young women were confined contrary to their inclinations, that this was a way of "men's control over the demographic surplus of women", a method leading to many tragedies; other researchers maintain that convents were an important alternative way of life which allowed some girls to avoid an unwanted marriage, to escape submission to the husband's rule and a wife's plight, which was frequently difficult not only because of maltreatment but also because of the inevitable circumstances (incessant pregnancies, the fear of bearing children in primitive medical conditions, the frequent deaths of women in childbirth, lingering diseases). Many researchers emphasize that nunneries were oases of culture, that they offered women an opportunity for self-fulfilment, for developing their talents, that they gave them access to education and enabled them to devote themselves to intellectual occupations to an extent that would have been unreachable outside enclosure. Borkowska's book adds many new arguments to the dispute and they are all the more important as they have been drawn from the rich conventual archives. The author does not idealize convents and nuns; she shows their struggle to attain religious perfection, draws attention to both their rises and falls, describes the diversity of their characters and the resulting complications; she simply reconstructs conventual life in all its complexity, using a full scale of colours, from light to dark ones. Her argumentation shows that she is familiar with cenobitic life, a life which is sometimes incomprehensible to an outsider, and has a perfect knowledge of sources and the epoch in which they were written.

The book is based on solid, large-scale research in archives (conventual archives, not yet examined by scholars, Central Archives of Historical Records) and also on a deep understanding of how the convents function, an understanding gained from the inside, from the author's own experience. The result is that the book throws light on problems which have been practically unknown so far and interprets many questions in a new, balanced way. The reader cannot remain insensible to the vivid, suggestive, frequently emotional language. A special flavour is added by quotations from sources, which impart an old Polish colouring and tone to the book; they show details, incidents and persons without which the argumentation would sometimes be too general. The chronological scope of the study has been well chosen; the book covers the period from the introduction of the Tridentine reforms to the end of the 18th century, that is, to Poland's partitions which changed the conditions of convents' existence in the Polish territories. The author has researched all religious orders for women in the old Commonwealth (including Lithuania), but shows a predilection for the Benedictines, which is understandable for she herself belongs to this order.

The book is divided into six parts: *People, Home, Simple Realities, Structures, Cycles and Disturbances, Convent Muses*. It opens with a chapter on admission to nunneries which destroys many myths concerning this question (e.g. it shows the struggle for voluntary access). The author says that more candidates always applied for admission than could be accepted and that a strict selection was therefore carried out. She says that even if a girl's family had exerted pressure, it depended on her character whether she succumbed or stood up to it. Borkowska presents extremely interesting conclusions concerning the age of postulants (usually between 14 and 20) and their civil status (unmarried women predominated, but there were also some widows), the tests they had to undergo and the inquiries which the convents

made about them and their families in order to avoid mistakes which might have led to painful, if not tragic, consequences for both sides, i.e. the convent and the postulant. The author goes on to present the group of novices and the successive grades and ceremonies they went through in convent life (the taking of the veil, conferment of convent name, irrevocable vows, consecration). Since the girls' families and even neighbours participated in these ceremonies, secular Baroque forms and pomp forced their way into convent life; speeches were therefore customary and the garments and rites were modelled on wedding rites. The author makes interesting remarks about the social background of the postulants, but the fact that the majority of the novices were noblewomen was not a specifically Polish feature; it was the same in Western Europe, e.g. in Italy and France. It would be interesting to analyze the novices' social background in greater detail (whether the majority of them came from the middle nobility, the petty nobility or whether they were the daughters of magnates and whether there were any regional differences in this respect).

A separate chapter discusses the dowry which, as is testified to by sources, was an indispensable contribution towards a nun's upkeep when she became a member of a cenobitic community. The author tries to dispel myths and general opinions on this matter. This seems to be the first time that this question has been shown on the basis of research into sources, that is, in a matter-of-fact concrete way. The author explains how big the dowries were, how they were contributed and used (including the important question of inflation which, especially in the 17th century, "devoured" dowries); she does not ignore disputes and lawsuits over dowries and also discusses exceptions to the accepted rules. A statistical presentation would have been welcome in this part of the book, but the use of examples is a more vivid method and is more understandable to the general reader. No less important is the chapter discussing the "cenobitic family", that is, the social structure in convents. It turns out that cenobitic families did not consist only of nuns, who did not even constitute the majority. Like a nobleman's manor house, each nunnery also housed residents, wards, servants, chaplains acting as counsellors and confessors, administrators, economic assistants, etc. Conflicts and tensions did appear (e.g. over the role of chaplains in the administration of nunneries); the situation was not always idyllic. There was also a great diversity within a nuns' community (the subject of a separate chapter); exceptionally talented women enriched the convent and its life, but they frequently caused additional troubles; this is not surprising for individualistic personalities and characters clashed in nunneries as they did in other places. These intricate problems constitute the most interesting parts of the book and it is to the author's credit that she has shown them. It is also important that she has paid attention to demographic questions, giving an estimate of the membership of convents and of the average life expectancy of nuns (death dates). It would be worth while to compare the life expectancy of women in a nunnery and in secular life at that time. The description of deaths in convents, the ceremonies accompanying agony and funerals needs comparing with the corresponding moments in a lay person's life. Baroque piety endowed these moments with special significance and adorned them with an expanded ritual, regarding them as the crowning of life. This passage ends with a digression in which the author recalls some monastic stories about ghosts and phantoms; it would have been worth while to add notes explaining people's mentality at that time when the world of the living and the world of the dead were closely linked in people's minds. Belief in daily intercourse with the dead was an important element of mentality in the old Polish epoch; it was part of the specific Baroque piety, and it is therefore not surprising that nunneries were not an exception in this respect, that they followed general norms.

The second part of the book deals with monastic architecture from the point of view of the function it was to perform; a convent was to be a home of "jointly shared retirement"; it was to serve the entire community and at the same time make it possible for the nuns to obey the requirements of monastic life, including the injunction of silence. The author discusses various foundations which promoted the construction of convents, the circumstances taken into consideration in choosing the right site for the construction, and the costs of constructing, remodelling and repairing a convent; repairs had to be made at short intervals because the materials used were not durable and disasters were frequent (fires, war ravages, floods). The reader will undoubtedly be interested to learn of the convents' structure, the way they were

divided into separate quarters, each of which performed a specific function: the choir, chapter-house, refectory, handwork room, locutory, gate and the nuns' cells, including their furnishing as well as the premises in the rear (kitchen, bathroom, toilets, laundry, vestuary, etc.). A separate chapter discusses the history of enclosure, its functions and the restrictions it imposed on the nuns, e.g. the ban on paid work. The author makes interesting remarks on the rules of poverty and simplicity binding in convents and contrasts them with the pictures, liturgical embroideries and other valuables which could be found in nunneries.

These reflections lead to the third part which deals with the reality of life in nunneries, that is, the Tridentine norms and practices with regard to poverty, its different models in various religious orders, the adaptation of foreign norms to Polish conditions (e.g. to the Polish climate). Everyday life is presented in the chapter *What did the nuns eat and drink*, which is an attempt to reconstruct the principles of monastic diet. It would have been worth while to consult Maria Dembińska's study on diet in Western convents and studies on food consumption in 16th century Poland by Andrzej Wyczański in order to compare the menus. Borkowska compares the yields from monastic fields with the average yields reaped in other farms and the methods of farming applied by monasteries with the general methods used at that time. The reader will find interesting information in the chapters discussing convents' relations with the towns in which they existed or which belonged to them and also the lawsuits started by nuns for various reasons.

The fourth part, entitled *Structures*, discusses monastic rules, the question of authority (mother superior, prioress), the hierarchy within a convent, that is the rules of obedience and the process whereby convents passed from the authority of male monasteries to the authority of bishops. In my opinion, the most interesting chapter in this part of the book is the one entitled *Tertium non datur*, which presents endeavours to set up larger communities embracing several nunneries, known as congregations. In this part the reader will also find a characterization of the activities of Magdalena Moręska, a remarkable figure in the history of Polish convents and religiousness in the old Polish period. This part of the book ends with two important chapters depicting convents' relations with the Church and their place in society (also relations between religious orders, including the rivalry between them).

The fifth part, *Cycles and Disturbances*, presents the daily and weekly routine in nunneries, the way each day of the week was celebrated, and the liturgical year. Since the latter was also observed in secular life during that epoch, it would have been worth while to underline what was special, specific in monastic life and what was connected with general old Polish customs. This extremely regulated existence governed by an iron discipline was however frequently disturbed by diseases (it would be interesting to investigate what diseases prevailed behind the monastic walls and which were common in the outside world), as well as by "the fury of the elements and peoples", that is, wars, epidemics, natural calamities, so frequent in the 17th and 18th centuries that they broke the established rhythm of monastic life for weeks, months and even years.

Part six, *Convent Muses*, presents nunneries as centres of culture and intellectual life. It discusses the role of music and singing in the nuns' life, their knowledge (libraries, the copying of books, their own creativeness), their recreation and entertainments, and also includes information on monastic theatre. It is to the credit of the author that she has brought the monastic theatre to light for it has not yet been discussed in literature.

What I miss in this interesting and very informative book is comparisons. Was life in a Polish nunnery different from life in an Italian or French convent? Did Sarmatism exert an influence on the mentality and attitude of Polish nuns and if so, to what extent? The nuns' family background must have been an important factor despite the fact that novitiate introduced them into a new world, but in spite of enclosure it was not a hermetic world. *La vie quotidienne des moines et chanoines réguliers au Moyen Age et Temps modernes*, ed. M. Derwich, vols. I-II, Wrocław 1995, published as a result of an international symposium which dealt with *Everyday Life in the Monasteries of Monks and Canons Regular in Medieval and Modern Europe*, held in Wrocław-Książ in December 1994, would have provided material for some comparative reflections (especially the study by Marie-Elisabeth from Liège

on the theory and practice of everyday life in contemplative convents in the Netherlands and northern France in the 16th and 17th centuries).

To sum up let me stress once again that S.M. Borkowska's book contains excellent materials; it is a pioneering book in Polish historiography, a book which raises important questions that have been attracting the attention of world scholars.

Maria Bogucka

Angela Rustenmeyer, Diana Siebert, *Alltagsgeschichte der Unterschichten im Russischen Reich (1861–1914). Kommentierte Bibliographie zeitgenössischer Titel und Bericht über die Forschung*, Stuttgart 1997, Franz Steiner Verlag, 279 Seiten + Diskette. Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des östlichen Europas. Band 46.

Vor allem muß man daran erinnern, daß die Verlagsreihe "Quellen und Studien..." bisher einige Dutzende wissenschaftlicher Arbeiten eingebracht hat, die der Geschichte Osteuropas gewidmet sind, mit einer beachtlichen Überlegenheit Rußlands¹. Neben Monographien wurden dort auch informatorische Bearbeitungen veröffentlicht, wie der von Erwin Oberländer publizierte Band, der die universitären und die außeruniversitären Einrichtungen präsentiert, die sich mit der Erforschung der Geschichte Osteuropas in Deutschland, Österreich und der deutschsprachigen Schweiz befassen, samt einem Verzeichnis der dort tätigen Forscher² und eine Analyse der Daten über die ethnische Struktur des russischen Kaiserreiches, enthalten in den Ergebnissen der Volkszählung von 1897³. Einer der Herausgeber dieses letzten Bandes ist Prof. Andreas Kappeler, Leiter des Seminars für Geschichte Osteuropas an der Universität in Köln. Eben dieser Wissenschaftler leitete den Forschungsentwurf, der die Bibliographie der Geschichte des Alltagslebens der unteren Schichten im europäischen Rußland zwischen 1861 und 1914 umfaßte. Das Ergebnis der von zwei Autorinnen geleisteten Arbeit ist der Band, zu dem er das Vorwort schrieb.

Zweck dieses Entwurfs ist die Erleichterung der Arbeit der Forscher (natürlich hauptsächlich der deutschen), die sich mit dem "Alltagsleben" der breiten Massen der Bevölkerung im zaristischen Rußland in seiner vorletzten (und der letzten in Friedenszeiten) historischen Periode befassen werden, d. i. von der Bauernreform bis zum ersten Weltkrieg. Mit Rücksicht auf ihren Charakter (Übersicht über die Historiographie und Bibliographie der relevanten Bücher aus der behandelten Epoche) kann diese Arbeit jedem Wissenschaftler behilflich sein, der sich mit der Problematik, die hier als "Alltagsleben" bezeichnet wird befaßt. Die weniger in der zeitgenössischen symbolischen Terminologie, die in den historischen Wissenschaften vorherrscht, bewandten Leser werden zur Kenntnis nehmen, daß dieser Terminus (*everyday life, vie quotidienne, Alltagsleben*) gegenwärtig das bezeichnet, was von der Sozialgeschichte nach der postmodernistischen Kritik übriggeblieben ist. Die Autorinnen formulieren "das Paradigma der Geschichte des Alltagslebens"⁴, indem sie darin folgende Bestandteile aussondern: Arbeitszeit und Freizeit, Volkskultur, geistige Welt und Alltagsleben, Grundbedürfnisse (des Menschen). Es ist hier nicht am Platze, dieses "Paradigma" einzuschätzen, wir bemerken lediglich, daß in der Bibliographie diese Einteilung breiter ausgebaut und durch ein Kapitel mit der Überschrift Zusammenleben ergänzt wurde, wo u.a.: Familie, Artels, *Obschtschina* (Dorfgemeinschaften) und... Frauen vorhanden sind. Man könnte sich die Frage stellen, ob ein solches "Paradigma" nicht die Ratlosigkeit der neuen Richtung angesichts — unter anderen

¹ Auf Polen beziehen sich folgende Arbeiten: Hans-Werner Rautenberg, *Der polnische Aufstand von 1863 und die europäische Politik*; Frank Golczewski, *Polnisch-jüdische Beziehungen 1881–1922*; Jürgen Pape, *Polen und die Sowjetunion 1938–1939*.

² Erwin Oberländer (Hrsg.), *Geschichte Osteuropas. Zur Entwicklung einer historischen Disziplin in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz 1945–1990*. 1992 "Quellen...", Band 35.

³ Henning Bauer, Andreas Kappeler, Brigitte Roth (Hrsg.), *Die Nationalitäten des Russischen Reiches in der Volkszählung von 1897, "Quellen..."*, Band 33. A. *Quellenkritische Dokumentation und Datenhandbuch*, 1991. B. *Ausgewählte Daten zur sozio-ethnischen Struktur des Russischen Reiches. Erste Auswertungen der Kölner NFR-Datenbank*, 1991.

⁴ S. 14–16.

— aller makrogesellschaftlichen und überregionalen Gemeinschaften widerspiegelt, unabhängig davon, ob man sie Strukturen oder irgendwie anders nennt.

Die zwei Hauptteile des Buches sind: die historiographische Skizze und die Bibliographie. Die wissenschaftlichen Forschungen in Rußland/UdSSR sind in einem Kapitel dargestellt (Diana Siebert), ein anderer ist der westlichen Historiographie gewidmet (Angela Rustemeyer). In bezug auf die russische/sowjetische Wissenschaft wurden besonders ethnographisch-ethnologische Bearbeitungen aus der Zeit vor der Revolution berücksichtigt, sowie diejenigen Arbeiten zur Geschichte der Arbeiter und Bauern, die zumindest Spuren der Problematik des "Alltagslebens" der "Unterschichten" widerspiegeln. An dieser Stelle werden Zweifel wach, die sich eben auf diesen letzten Terminus beziehen. Im Text ist lediglich von dem Proletariat, den Bauern und eventuell den Randgruppen die Rede. Wohin gehören aber die großen Mengen des armen Kleinbürgertums, das z.B. im jüdischen Milieu, aber schließlich nicht nur dort, so zahlreich vertreten war? Bestimmt nicht nur zu den höheren Schichten, und eine Mittelklasse erwähnen die Autorinnen überhaupt nicht. Wahrscheinlich waren eben diese zahlenmäßig starken Schichten ebenfalls in die "Unterschichten" zu zählen.

Die eigenen Errungenschaften der russischen Wissenschaftler in dem behandelten Bereich ist aus verschiedenen Gründen nicht imponant. Im zweiten Teil der historiographischen Skizze schildert die Autorin die bereits beachtlichen Leistungen der angelsächsischen Geschichtsschreibung im Bereich des Alltagslebens der Volksschichten in Rußland. Das Interesse der Franzosen für diese Problematik ist minimal, und das der Deutschen gar rudimentär. Eine gewisse Ausnahme bildet die letzters modische Frauenproblematik. Mit der Einschränkung allerdings, daß es hier in der Regel um Arbeiten geht, die nicht dem Alltagsleben gewidmet sind, sondern anderen Fragen, wo bei Gelegenheit als Hintergrund der Alltag jener Zeiten dargestellt wird. In der angelsächsischen Historiographie wird die Alltagsproblematik häufiger frontal behandelt und bildet einen direkten Forschungsgegenstand, in Übereinstimmung mit den in diesen Ländern bereits gefestigten Präferenzen oder thematischen Gewohnheiten.

Den übrigen, überwiegenden Teil des Buches füllt die Bibliographie. Sie enthält 532 annotierte Posten, mit Kommentar, eventuell einem Inhaltsverzeichnis und anderen Informationen, wie auch mit der Angabe des Ortes der Aufbewahrung (Bibliothek). Berücksichtigt wurden 12 deutsche wissenschaftliche Bibliotheken, die Russische Nationalbibliothek (Saltykow-Stschedrin-Bibliothek) in St. Petersburg und die Universitätsbibliothek in Helsinki. Das verweist auf die Reichweite der durchgeführten Abfrage. *Pro domo sua* ist zu bemerken, daß die Universitätsbibliothek in Warschau zahlreiche Veröffentlichungen aus der behandelten Zeit besitzt und durch die Abfrage (natürlich?) nicht erfaßt wurde. Ein solides Sachregister und Autorenverzeichnis erleichtert die Benutzung der Bibliographie. Überdies wurde dem Buch eine Diskette beigelegt, die weitere 500 Posten enthält, eingeteilt wie die vorigen und mit identischen Verzeichnissen versehen, aber schon ohne Annotationen. Insgesamt haben wir also über 1000 Posten (ausschließlich selbständige Drucke). Zu bemerken ist, daß die Autorinnen sich streng an die 50 Gouvernements des europäischen Rußlands halten und Informationen über das Königreich Polen oder über Finnland hier nur vereinzelt zu finden sind.

Die Autorinnen haben ihre eintausend Bücher von 2500 gewählt, die sie u.a. aus Arbeiten und Bibliographien herausgeschrieben, deren Liste sie angeben. Die komplexe Beschaffenheit dieses Materials ist schwer einzuschätzen. Manchmal scheint die Anwahl ziemlich zufällig zu sein, aber vielleicht widerspiegelt sie tatsächlich die bescheidene editorische Produktion? Außerdem sind die Reichweite der in Betracht kommenden Fragen und — was damit zusammenhängt — die Kriterien der Selektion nicht allzu klar abgesteckt, was viel Spielraum für Willkür übrigläßt. Vielleicht war hier nicht belanglos die Tatsache, daß die postmodernistische Kritik der Sozialgeschichte leistungsfähiger war in der Destruktion als in der Bearbeitung einer entsprechend begründeten und zugleich praktisch brauchbaren Basis der methodologischen Forschungen. Jedenfalls können die in dem Buch enthaltenen Informationen, den Intentionen der Forscher und Editoren gemäß, den Historikern behilflich sein, die sich mit einer Problematik befassen möchten, welche die allgemein gepflegte Geschichte der *rerum gestarum* der Zaren, der ersten Sekretäre und der Chefs der NKWD überschreitet.

Janusz Żarnowski

Włodzimierz Suleja, *Józef Piłsudski*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1995, Ossolineum, 383 pp. + 5 sup.¹

Włodzimierz Suleja is one of those scholars best prepared for writing a monograph of Józef Piłsudski. His rich oeuvre, numbering several book publications² and dozens of articles, is mainly focussed on the subject of political thought, especially that devoted to the regaining of Polish independence, on those who created this current and put the idea into practice and on the issue of the reconstruction of the Polish state. The subject of his studies has for many years included the problems and people connected with the activity of Józef Piłsudski. In this respect he has at his disposal a vast erudition and an adequately developed scholarly workshop, i.e. assets that are indispensable to writing a valuable biography of an outstanding figure.

The figure of Józef Piłsudski has been the subject of dozens of source publications and hundreds of studies of various kinds³. Therefore one should underline that W. Suleja has made use of new sources, especially those from the Józef Piłsudski Institute in New York. Documents preserved in the collections of this Institute, especially the Michał Mościcki Records, The General Aide-de-Camp of the Commander-in-Chief Records, Gen. Lucjan Żeligowski's Liquidation Commission Records — enabled the author to introduce new cognitive statements into scientific circulation.

It seems, however, that the author does not always retain a suitable distance, a critical attitude towards the sources he uses, especially those produced by Piłsudski himself. Of supreme importance are Piłsudski's numerous letters. However, those addressed to private recipients are of different documental value from those written to political opponents, or lastly — to the closest collaborators (written in the form of instruction). The author should retain still greater distance in his attitude to Piłsudski's rich publicistic work, whose predominantly didactic-propaganda function is only occasionally mentioned in the book. Also the romantic style, metaphors and similes used by Piłsudski, and after 1923 his increasingly brutal expressions require special caution and moderation in the analysis and interpretation of those texts. One sometimes feels a shortage of a more insightful criticism of the sources in this work. Where the author's criticism is more thorough, as in the interpretation of Piłsudski's letters to Leonarda Lewandowska (pp. 19–20), of his articles for the socialist press (pp. 21–25), or materials where the Commander predicts the course of World War I (pp. 107–110), in which the author differs from the interpretations of Andrzej Galiński, the documental value of his work is greater. These shortages are to a certain extent justified by the fact that the book has been published in the biographical series of Ossolineum, addressed to wide circles of readers, which means that the author could not present his full scholarly workshop, wherein also the criticism of sources.

It seems that this was the reason why W. Suleja could provide in his *Bibliographical Note* only a concise discussion of scholarly works, as well as “those which create both the 'black' and the 'golden' legend of the Marshal” and which it is so difficult to isolate from the rest (p. 364).

¹ The above published text is an abridgement of the review which is to appear in “Sobótka”.

² The scholarly books closely connected with the subject under review include: W. Suleja, *Orientacja austro-polska w latach I wojny światowej (do aktu 5 listopada 1916 roku)* [The Austro-Polish Orientation during World War I, up to the Act of November 5, 1916], Wrocław, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1992, 444 pp.; i d e m., *Próba budowy zrębów polskiej państwowości w okresie istnienia Tymczasowej Rady Stanu* [The Attempt to Build the Foundations of Polish Statehood during the Rule of the Temporary Council of the State], Wrocław, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1981, 378 pp.

³ In the first place one should mention here the most extensive biography by Andrzej Galiński: *Józef Piłsudski 1867–1935*, 3rd edition, emended and complemented, Warszawa 1990, 783 pp. (he made use of the collections of the Piłsudski Institute in New York, although to a smaller extent than W. Suleja did in his work) as well as W. Jędrzejewicz, J. Cisek, *Kalendarium życia Józefa Piłsudskiego 1867–1935* [The Calendar of Józef Piłsudski's Life 1867–1935], vol. I: 1867–1918, 415 pp.; vol. II: 1918–1926, 445 pp.; vol. III: 1926–1935, 424 pp.; Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1994 and also W. Jędrzejewicz, *Kronika życia Józefa Piłsudskiego 1867–1935* [The Chronicle of Józef Piłsudski's Life 1867–1935], vol. I: 1867–1920, Londyn 1977, 544 pp.; vol. II: 1921–1935, Londyn 1977, 605 pp.; *Complements and modifications for volumes I and II*, Londyn 1986, 96 pp.

The polemic threads, followed both objectively and with great culture, although important, do not occupy too much space. One feels that this caused a thematical impoverishment of the book, considering the fact that more and more controversial questions continue to be raised about the figure of Józef Piłsudski.

I would especially consider it useful to enter into a polemic with the one-sided approaches to the Commander's stand on the issues that are most important to the matters under analysis and to our country. However, a lot of information provided by Suleja enables the reader better to follow and understand the fortunes of the hero of the book and form his own opinion, without exclusively relying on those of the author. One can also acknowledge the honesty of the author's declaration that he "does not conceal he likes the hero of his book. Nor that he views him subjectively" (p. 5). Those authors who — as e.g. Stefan Arski — "settled down to writing with a thought about dispelling legends and myths" concerning Piłsudski and declared "to preserve a maximum objectivity in the presentation and analysis of the facts in their fight against the legend"⁴, most of the time erred in selecting the sources and data, in the one-sidedness of their approach. Some disproportions in the approach to certain issues may be considered controversial. However, I consider it right that the third part, embracing the shortest period of merely four years (1918–1922) has almost the same number of pages (89) as others, much more extensive chronologically (part I — 77 pp. for 40 years, part II — 87 pp. for 10 years, part IV — 89 pp. for 12 years). This period was the richest in events and it constituted a turning point for the whole country.

One can, however, raise objections to the excessively brief presentation of some issues, e.g. the threads concerning the Marshal's private life, the May 1926 coup, or the last nine years of his life. Many Polish historians—biographers consider the private life of outstanding figures less important, and even unworthy of scholarly investigation. I do not share this opinion, since such an approach not only impoverishes the character described, but sometimes even makes it impossible to trace the influence of personal, private motivations on public decisions. Although W. Suleja appreciates the influence of the Marshal's state of health on the way that he tackled matters of state, to the detriment of his work he does not develop these threads.

Although W. Suleja promises to publish a separate study of the May coup, it is a pity that in the book under discussion he devotes to it only 24 pages, considering how many sources, hitherto unknown to scholars, and throwing a lot of new light on those events, he has succeeded to collect.

W. Suleja devotes only 44 pages of print to the last 9 years of the Marshal's life. This may be the result of his opinion of the decreasing role that J. Piłsudski played in this period in the political life of our country. This period, however, saw events in which the Marshal took part that were too important and even crucial to the system of the state, to be given such a brief and even superficial discussion.

It is worth noting that the work has a very lucid construction. The concise titles of its four parts, each consisting of three chapters, aptly characterize their content: I. Conspirator (1867–1907): Deportee — Conspirator — Fighter; II. Commander (1908–1918): Irredentist — Commander of Riflemen — Emulation; III. Leader (1918–1922): The Construction of the State — Wilno — Kijów — Warszawa — Peace at Last; IV. Dictator (1923–1935): Recluse — Coup d'état — The Last Years.

The value of the book is heightened by the choice of photographs, less known in Poland, coming from the collections of the Józef Piłsudski Institute in New York.

Finally I would like to refer to some of the most important statements, theses and conclusions presented by the author. The scholarly rank of this valuable book stimulates one not only to relate them but also to put forward one's own suggestions, and sometimes to present a different view.

In part I of his book W. Suleja discusses the beginnings of J. Piłsudski's youthful conspiracy, five years of his stay in Siberia where he was deported, and most extensively — his activity in the Polish Socialist Party (PPS) before its split. He presents with insight and in

⁴ S. Arski, *My pierwsza brygada* (We, the First Brigade), Warszawa 1962, 479 pp.

an unconventional way Piłsudski's participation in the shaping of socialist thought, his great contribution to the organizational development of *PPS*. At the same time W. Suleja pays a lot of attention to ordinary, drab, everyday occupations of the conspirator engaged in printing, circulation of the press, keeping up domestic and international organizational ties, and gaining financial means for this activity.

Parts I and II of the book aptly point out Piłsudski's particular interest in the thought devoted to Polish independence. Considering, however, that *PPS*'s activity was mainly concentrated on the workers who were not always conscious of the importance of the national idea, it is worth while attempting an answer to the question in what way Piłsudski — or more broadly speaking, the "Robotnik" (The Worker) periodical he edited — tried to convince this social group of the importance of the independence of Poland. The more so as — according to W. Suleja's statement (pp. 53, 58) — Piłsudski thought that not only workers but also peasants could play their part in the fight for independence. It is a pity that this important thematic thread remains outside the author's orbit of interest both in part I and II of the book. It is true that in the years 1908–1919 Piłsudski showed less interest in social conditionings of the independence movement than the parties he co-operated with, however he too — as the author states himself — "was perfectly aware of the inspiring role of the social programme" (p. 96, cf. pp. 115–116). He also observed with great interest the attitude of the population to the Polish Legions (pp. 126, 129–131). The social aspects of the independence movement have been given only a short mention in the work (pp. 89–90). In view of the fact that these threads have not been developed in part I and II of the book, W. Suleja's statement: "The reservation about the atrophy or lack of ear for social problems among the people connected with conspiratorial independence movement is a sheer misunderstanding" (p. 90) is not convincing.

This, however, does not undermine the author's main expositions presented in part II, where he says that in the years 1908–1914, and especially during World War I, the political–diplomatic game, the "launching of the Polish cause" and attempts at consolidation connected with it, the shaping of mutual relations within the camp of independence movement (the attitude to W. Sikorski), occupied a supreme place in Piłsudski's dealings. The way this matter is presented shows the author's vast erudition and deep knowledge of the sources. Moreover part I is distinguished by a synthetic approach to the problems.

The most innovatory in the work is its part III and the chapter about the May coup d'état. This is — as I have already mentioned — the effect of introducing into the scientific circulation the important sources preserved at the Piłsudski Institute in New York that increase our knowledge of the most important problems of the beginnings of the 2nd Polish Republic and the position of the Leader of the State in solving them. This concerns especially such domains as: J. Piłsudski's influence on the coming to an understanding with the Germans as to the evacuation of their troops from the Polish Kingdom and the *Ober-Ost*, his influence on Poland's foreign policy, the shape of Her frontiers, the construction of the Polish Army, and seeking in these matters the assistance of the Entente and the "national consolidation" with the main forces at work in Poland and with the National Polish Committee in exile.

Thus, e.g. in the matter of shaping the Polish eastern frontier on the basis of federation concepts (though treated pragmatically, p. 214) Piłsudski — as W. Suleja extensively explains — encountered obstacles not only on the part of the "White" Russia, but also the Entente as well as the newly-risen states on the western outskirts of the former Tsarist Empire. The analysis of Piłsudski's stand on the demarcation of the borders of the constituencies in the published electoral law as well as of the support he gave in conspiracy to the Great Poland uprising and the Silesian Polish Military Organization, while Warsaw was officially disinterested in them "is sufficient proof that the Commander treated the Western side (of the state border — J.M.) with the utmost attention" (p. 190), as the result of which "the persistently sustained thesis of a one-sided, eastern bias of Piłsudski (...) should undergo a radical revision" (p. 182).

It is also worth drawing attention to the letter of the Chief of the General Staff Gen. Tadeusz Rozwadowski to Józef Piłsudski, quoted extensively in the work [pp. 244–245 after *Sąsiedzi wobec wojny. Wybór dokumentów* (*Neighbours In Face of the War. A Selection of Documents*), ed. J. Cisek, Londyn 1990, pp. 19–24], that unequivocally proves that the

Marshal was the author of the attack on the Wieprz river of August 16, 1920, (the previously planned August 17) which "in effect became a strategic turning point in the battle on the Vistula river" (p. 245).

The Marshal's stand on the crucial problems of the country after 1923 is discussed by W. Suleja in a very ambivalent way. The most convincing is his presentation of the origin of the May coup and its consequences. The author points out that, contrary to the opinion of some historians, neither after the murder of President Narutowicz in 1922 (p. 265), nor during the Cracow events in 1923 (p. 277), nor during the officers' demonstration at Sulejówek on November 15, 1925, (pp. 286–287) did Piłsudski plan a coup d'état. He began his "play for power" — according to W. Suleja — only in Spring 1926 (p. 290), but he did not intend to "take up arms" (p. 291). A similar stand was taken by Piłsudski also at the first stage of May 1926 events. On the other hand W. Suleja is critical of the effects of the coup on the state system: "The May 1926 events resulted in a gradual departure from the systemic model recorded in the March 1921 Constitution. The parliamentary–cabinet system was ousted by a Polish kind of authoritarianism. The kind closely connected with the person of Józef Piłsudski" (p. 315).

The author charges Piłsudski with the responsibility for using physical force against his political adversaries while he seems to vindicate the methods of his political combat against the opposition gathered in *Centrolew* (Centre–Left).

While characterizing the motives of action taken by J. Piłsudski and by his opponents from *Centrolew* (just as before — from the right–centre parliamentary majority) W. Suleja, however, seems to apply different criteria of assessment. He explains Piłsudski's line of action not only in "the Brześć affair" but also many other important and "troublesome", difficult issues by superior reasons, aimed at the "interest of the state". For Piłsudski, as the author emphasizes many times, "power was only the means, not the aim in itself" (p. 320). While he imputes (just as the Marshal did) to opposition solely utilitarian, personal, party motives that interfered with the "reasons of State" and "its safety".

Given the knowledge of J. Piłsudski's earlier merits in the fight for Poland's independence and the reconstruction of Her statehood, one cannot doubt the sincerity of his intentions. However some investigative questions suggest themselves: Did Piłsudski and his surroundings constitute the only force in Poland that was led by reasons of State and that indicated the right alternative of Her development? Could not similar values be perceived also in the programme of *Centrolew*, which would explain the motives of its activists' behaviour? Indeed, many of them had been, a short time before, Piłsudski's close collaborators. Finally, what under those conditions better served the consolidation of the state: the defence of the principles of parliamentary democracy in keeping with the March Constitution — that was *Centrolew's* aim, or "the Polish variety of authoritarianism" that was controlled by the Marshal? Without answering this question it seems impossible to show the actual role of Piłsudski in the life of Poland in the years 1923–1935. Moreover, unless an equal measure of evaluation is applied to both parties of the conflict, one may suspect the author, despite the intentions he declares, of "justifying" the Marshal's actions, seeking a "clue" to his role by attributing those superior reasons to his dubious decisions.

Viewed against the hitherto profuse literature of the subject, W. Suleja's book stands out by its solid cognitive values both — as I have tried to show — on its documental–informative plane and in the sphere of new statements, conclusions and hypotheses. Other researchers cannot be expected to discover much more in the sphere of sources and facts, however, richer by the experience of their generations they can posit new research questions and give new interpretations of the known documentation as well as formulate new opinions and conclusions.

Jan Molenda

Waldemar Grabowski, *Delegatura Rządu Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej na Kraj (The Home Delegation of the Government of the Republic of Poland)*, Wydawnictwo PAX, Warszawa 1995, 294 pp.

Let me start by explaining that by the Polish Underground State I mean the Polish Government's Delegation whose legal structures were subordinated to the Polish Government-in-Exile (which after the defeat in September 1939 had its headquarters first in Paris and then in London). In addition to the underground armed forces (later called the Home Army), political and administrative authorities began to be formed as soon as Poland was occupied by Nazi Germany and the USSR; in time, they became what was known as the Home Delegation of the Government of the Polish Republic, headed by the Government's Home Delegate. The first temporary delegate was Colonel Jan Skorobohaty-Jakubowski (from 26.05.1940) who was succeeded by a collective delegation; next authority over the whole country was entrusted (by stages) to Delegate Cyryl Ratajski; his successors were Jan Piekalkiewicz (1942–1943), who was murdered by the Germans, and Jan S. Jankowski (1943–1945), who died in a Soviet prison. The Government's delegate directed the central underground administration and the network of underground organs all over Poland.

The last few years have witnessed an enormous increase in historical studies on those facts concerning the 1939–1945 period which were previously taboo or were reserved for authors trusted by the authorities. One of the issues which were previously completely ignored was the political system of the Polish Underground State, and this is why great attention has been paid to this question in the last few years¹.

One of the pioneers of research into the Polish Underground State is Waldemar Grabowski. The book he has now published was completed in 1988, but its publication has been delayed for many reasons. Although Grabowski knew (perhaps not fully)² that many studies had lately been published on this subject, he decided to confine himself to supplements in the Annex and bibliographic data for, as he says, "The new material does not change the fundamental conclusions presented in the book" (p. 13). I understand the author's difficulties and am fully aware of the fact that he was the first to establish many facts concerning the Home Delegation (facts which were later ascertained independently by others) and that he presents many questions more fully than any other author. It is regrettable, however, that a young author who should not lack mental energy has so easily renounced the ambition to publish a monograph which would, to some extent, be definitive as regards the Polish

¹ Cf. in particular the text I wrote in 1989, *Polskie Państwo Podziemne (PPP) 1939–1945 (The Polish Underground State (PPP) 1939–1945)* published in: *Walka Podziemna na Pomorzu w latach 1939–1945. W 50 rocznicę powstania Służby Zwycięstwu Polski. Materiały sesji w Toruniu 27–28.09.1989*, ed. J. Sziling, Toruń 1990, pp. 11–52; the essay lists studies on this subject and presents the history of the concept. My first popular synthesis of the activity of the PPP was *Polskie Państwo Podziemne. Z dziejów walki cywilnej 1939–1945 (The Polish Underground State. A History of Civilian Warfare 1939–1945)*, Warszawa 1994. The most important publications brought out in the last two years are two monographs by G. Górski, published too late for Grabowski to use: *Administracja Polski Podziemnej w latach 1939–1945. Studium historyczno-prawne (The Administration of Underground Poland in the Years 1939–1945. An Historical and Legal Study)*, Toruń 1995, and *Ustrój polskiego państwa podziemnego 1939–1944. Studium historyczno-prawne (The Political System of the Polish Underground State 1939–1944. An Historical and Legal Study)*, Lublin 1995. See also S. Salmonsowicz, *L'Etat polonais clandestin dans les années 1939–1945. Un Aperçu général*, in: *De la Res publica a los Estados Modernos*. "Journées Internationales d'Histoire du Droit", Bilbao 1992, pp. 383–393.

² One could name many studies published during the last five years which the author has ignored or has only incidentally mentioned without discussing their content. In my opinion, he should have expressed his view on the state of research (e.g. on works by C. Madajczyk, T. Strzembosz, W. Bartoszewski, and others). For instance, Grabowski does not even mention the controversial studies by Z. Hirszt who in his first book, *Instytucje polityczno-prawne okupowanego państwa polskiego w latach 1939–1945 (The Political and Legal Institutions of the Occupied Polish State in the Years 1939–1945)*, Białystok 1985, placed the legal Polish Underground State on a par with the communist underground, did not use the term PPP and magnified the role of political parties (in particular the Polish Workers' Party) in the history of the Underground, and who in a new version of this book, entitled *Państwo Polskie po układzie Ribbentrop-Mołotow (The Polish State after the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact)*, Białystok 1991, changed some of his views but continued to write about "the creative role of political parties" in the Polish Underground and expressed many controversial theoretical opinions.

Government's Home Delegation or which would at least take into account the already published results of research. After all, some of Grzegorz Górski's fragmentary studies, omitted by Grabowski, appeared in 1990–1991³, and J. Paśnik's monograph⁴, which the author quotes only incidentally, was published in 1991. Grabowski should therefore have used the monograph extensively for it mainly concerns legal questions which he does not consider at length and which were of fundamental importance for the history of the Polish Underground State, a specific political structure. As a historian of law I will add that what I miss is an introductory explanation of the legal nature of the Polish Underground State, for this is an important element of the very conception of the Government's Home Delegation. These questions have already been discussed at length in other studies but by omitting them in his book the author places the structures of the Home Delegation in a vacuum, so to say.

Let us take a look at the construction of the book. Apart from the very concise first chapter, which concerns the beginning of conspiracy, the book is divided into only four extensive chapters: I. *The Office of the Government's Home Delegate*; II. *The Government's Home Delegation during the Warsaw Rising*; III. *The Government's Home Delegation after the Warsaw Rising*; and IV. *The Government's Regional and District Delegations*. The book ends with an extensive *Annex I: Documents* which comprises some important texts, and *Annex II: Biographic Notes (the Government's Delegates and their deputies, department directors, regional delegates)*. It also contains many valuable illustrations, diagrams and indexes. Before I go any further let me say that the book is valuable and will continue to be useful despite the critical remarks I have already made or will still add. The most valuable is the extensive chapter on the structure of the Government's Delegation (pp. 39–130), the only weak point of which is its static character. The author deals incidentally with the disputes over the structure of the Government's Delegation and with vehement personal disputes, that is problems which confronted the Underground's policy. In a way he detaches the Delegation from the political life of the Polish Underground State and its institutions, in particular the Council of National Unity. Nor do we learn much about the relationship between the apparatus of the Supreme Command of the Union of Armed Struggle—Home Army and the Government's Delegation when it was being formed. The two institutions were linked in various ways, also by their staffs⁵. The main problem which cannot be fully solved by a reviewer is that Górski's monographs on the administration of the Underground State and Grabowski's book on the organization and staff of the Government's Delegation, though published almost at the same time, differ in many important details. Górski's presentation of some subjects (pp. 125–221) is fuller, more detailed and, what is important, is dynamic, that is, it shows evolution (also as regards the staff). Grabowski's presentation is, as a rule, static and rarely informs the reader about the evolution of a structure. In my opinion it is necessary to verify and combine the information supplied by the two authors who, it seems, acted independently and did not make use of the same sources. Since both authors avoid detailed source references in cases which are doubtful and seldom correct the items of information which they regard as false, it is difficult for a reviewer to take a clear stand on many questions.

³ Cf. *Administracja Zmilitaryzowana WZ-AK "Teczka" 1941–1943 (The Militarized Administration, Union of Armed Struggle—Home Army "Teczka" 1941–1943)*, "Studia Historyczne" 1990, № 3–4; *Ziemie Zachodnie i Północne w planach KG WZ-AK i Delegatury Rządu RP na Kraj. Dzieje Biura Zachodniego i Wojskowej Administracji Ziemi Nowych w latach 1940–1944 (The Western and Northern Territories in the Plans of the Supreme Command of the Union of Armed Struggle—Home Army and the Home Delegation of the Polish Government. A History of the Western Bureau and the Military Administration of the New Territories in the Years 1940–1944)*, "Sobótka" 1989, № 2; *Dolny Śląsk w planach KG WZ-AK (Lower Silesia in the Plans of the Supreme Command of the Union of Armed Struggle—Home Army)*, "Sobótka" 1989, № 2.

⁴ J. Paśnik, *Status prawny Delegata Rządu na Kraj (The Legal Status of the Government's Home Delegate)*, Warszawa 1991.

⁵ It was L. Muzyczka, later on chief of "Teczka", who started to organize the Government's Delegation and appointed such important persons as Jankowski, Dybowski and W. Szubert to the first posts. These questions have been presented in G. Górski's studies; see also S. Salmonowicz, *Ludwik Muzyczka 1900–1977, polityk i żołnierz (Ludwik Muzyczka 1900–1977, a Politician and Soldier)*, Warszawa 1992. *Nota bene*, the interesting photographs in Grabowski's book show many persons who were Muzyczka's subordinates but there is no photograph of Muzyczka himself, although he was one of the initiators of the Polish Underground State.

Grabowski has almost completely disregarded the consequences which the merger of the Militarized Administration of the Supreme Command of the Home Army with the administration of the Government's Delegation had for the staff and organization of the two institutions, even though this is an important question. It will be impossible to obtain an unequivocal reply to some controversial questions concerning the staff or organization (the name of a given structure, its place in the general structure of the Government's Delegation)⁶, for both authors frequently base their information on accounts by persons who held second-grade posts, because the majority of the most important figures of that epoch were already dead when the two authors started their research. I think that the employees of the underground apparatus did not always know exactly the structure of which they were a part and who held the leading posts in these structures (and from when). On the whole, it can be said that Grabowski's information concerning staffs is more detailed than that provided by Górski; for instance, Grabowski provides partial information about the staff of district Delegations. There are many differences in the two authors' statements about the organization and staff of the departments of the Government's Delegation, but I am not always able to ascertain whose information is more reliable. I think that Grabowski is wrong when he says that Jerzy Michalewski ceased to be Chief of the Presidential Bureau already in the autumn of 1941. It is known that when Michalewski left the post in Ratajski's Bureau he at once started working (in any case in November 1942)⁷ in the Militarized Administration ("Teczka" — The File). Grabowski's information is based on just one account which is in contradiction to all data concerning Michalewski. As regards detailed questions which should be corrected or examined, I would like to signal the following:

P. 17: the author assumes that after the arrest of Niedzialkowski Maciej Rataj became a civilian commissioner at the SZP (*Służba Zwycięstwa Polski* — Polish Victory Service). But the fact is that Rataj was arrested on November 28, 1939 and Niedzialkowski on December 22, 1939 and as far as I know, Rataj did not hold this post. P. 22: it is not certain that the "Entrenchment Group" proposed to subordinate its civilian structures to Delegate Ratajski at the beginning of his activity. This is not confirmed by any document of the Polish Underground State and the information is doubtful if one recalls the subsequent policy of its leaders, who set up the National Armed Forces. PP. 21–24: this is a question which goes beyond the scope of Grabowski's book but is worth signalling; J. Fietz-Fietowicz's activity in Budapest, various aspects of which are obscure, deserves a detailed objective examination. It can be said that Fietz-Fietowicz frequently acted to the detriment of the conspiracy in Poland, especially the Union of Armed Struggle; but did he follow Stanisław Kot's instructions or did he act on his own initiative? P. 29: Grabowski mentions "Halina", head of the secretariat in the Coordination Bureau; her name was Halina Batog (Budnik after the war, now dead); she was later head of the liaison section and secretariat of the Militarized Administration. P. 31: Jan Dybowski, whom L. Muzyczka appointed organizer of the Communication Department, later went over to the Militarized Administration and for some time directed the Military Communications Bureau there (according to Muzyczka's account which I have). After some time Muzyczka recalled Dybowski from this post; his successor was Colonel Tadeusz Kurcusz from right-wing circles who was later disloyal to the Supreme Command of the Union of Armed Struggle — the Home Army and became commander in chief of the National Armed Forces. P. 34: Professor Halban, not Halbana, was historian of law at the John Casimir University in Lwów. PP. 36–37: the author's information about the Militarized Administration of the Union of Armed Struggle — Home Army is incomplete and inaccurate in the light of what Górski has established on the basis of sources. Grabowski writes about seven Military Bureaux of "The File" (counterparts of the departments of the Government's Delegation) but in fact there were nine bureaux; Grabowski has left out the Supplies Bureau and has wrongly presented the Bureau of Communication and the Telecommunication Bureau as one unit. P. 41: it is not clear whether the author repeats Ratajski's words of December 1941 about the necessity of

⁶ This concerns, for instance, the structure of the Presidential Bureau of the Government's Delegation.

⁷ Cf. Michalewski's biography in A. K u n e r t, *Stownik biograficzny konspiracji warszawskiej 1939–1944* (*Biographic Dictionary of the Warsaw Conspiracy 1939–1944*), vol. II, Warszawa 1987, pp. 128–129.

incorporating "Ducal Prussia" into Poland to the letter. The term was then anachronistic and incomplete; in all plans Poland demanded the incorporation of "East Prussia", that is, the territories of the former Duchy of Prussia and Warmia which was incorporated into the former Ducal Prussia in 1772; from that time these territories were called East Prussia; the name "West Prussia" was used for the former Royal Prussia without Warmia. PP. 63–64: the question of the New Territories Bureau of the Government's Delegation should have been linked with the activity conducted by the Militarized Administration at the same time. *Nota bene*, W. Dymarski has written a doctoral thesis (under the supervision of Wojciech Wrzesiński of Wrocław University) entitled *The Territories Demanded by Poland in the Political Prognoses of the Polish Underground* which raises many questions connected with the activity of the Government's Delegation in this field; cf. also G. Górski's *Administration*, pp. 196–199. P. 116: the status and evolution of the Foreign Affairs Section of the Government's Delegation are presented more fully by Górski, pp. 204 ff. P. 127: the organization of the National Defence Department of the Government's Delegation has not been presented exhaustively and accurately. Some issues are still unclear. It is a fact that during the Warsaw Rising General Bór ordered on September 25, 1944 that a National Defence Department should be organized within the Supreme Command of the Home Army; Jerzy Michalewski, who was in the Delegation's good books, was appointed head of the Department (undoubtedly in agreement with the Government's Delegate Jankowski); in my opinion it was only after the Warsaw Rising that Michalewski passed with this nucleus of the National Defence Department to the Government's Delegation⁸. PP. 133–134: the information on the decision to start the Warsaw Rising is obsolete in the light of latest research. PP. 139–140: in view of the present state of research more could have been written about the activity of the Government's Delegation during the rising, but I admit that the subject taken up by the author is very vast and some cuts were inevitable. However, why has Grabowski not dealt more extensively with the role played by the Government's Delegation in the implementation of "The Tempest" plan? Perhaps the question deserves a separate more detailed presentation. P. 171: Kaimierz Kolańczyk, not Kolończyk. Let me add a few things to the information about the Government's Delegation in Pomerania. A. Antczak's third deputy was Zygmunt Milczewski, and Zdzisław Dandelski was his advisor. The Bureau of Delegate Antczak and most of his collaborators were in Warsaw, not in Toruń. The Department of Labour and Social Welfare was directed in Warsaw by Adam Steinborn, a representative of a well known Toruń family and Home Army officer; the Administration Department was headed by I. Wujek. An Agency of the Regional Delegation was active in Toruń from March 1941; it was headed by Franciszek Rochowiak who, alongside Lipski, active in Bydgoszcz, played the key role in Pomerania. Much of Grabowski's personnel information does not agree with the materials of the Pomeranian Archives of the Home Army in Toruń and with the latest publications⁹.

Owing to the vast scope of the book and the continued existence of blanks, it has not been possible in a concise review to consider all the threads presented by Grabowski. In the present situation the doubling of research into the neglected aspects of Poland's history in 1939–1945 (Górski's and Grabowski's studies) has its good points. Despite the many reservations I have made about Grabowski's book, I think his study is a welcome contribution.

Stanisław Salmonowicz

⁸ These questions have not been solved by M. Ney-Krwawicz either; see my remarks in *Z dziejów struktur Polskiego Państwa Podziemnego (1939–1945)* (*A History of the Structures of the Polish Underground State (1939–1945)*), "Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne" 1992, № 1–2, pp. 184–185. By ambiguously linking September decisions with those taken in November, W. Grabowski asserts that Lt. Col. Ludwik Muzyczka became acting head of administration in the National Defence Department of the Government's Delegation. Muzyczka did in fact receive this nomination but in September, when it was planned to merge a part of "Teczka" with this department; however, after the fall of the Warsaw Rising Muzyczka was sent to a POW camp and could not work in the National Defence Department. *Nota bene*, it seems to be an illusion that the Department was a part of the Government's Delegation at the end of 1944 and the beginning of 1945.

⁹ Cf. K. Komorowski, *Konspiracja pomorska 1939–1947. Leksykon (The Pomeranian Conspiracy 1939–1947. Lexicon)*, Gdańsk 1993, entry: *Delegatura Okręgowa Rządu*, pp. 130–133.

Boris Meissner, Dieter Blumenwitz, Gilbert Gornig (hrsg.), *Das Potsdamer Abkommen*, III. Teil: *Rückblick nach 50 Jahren*, Völkerrechtliche Abhandlungen, Band 4/III. Teil, Wien 1996, 243 pp.

The German "Studiengruppe für Politik und Völkerrecht" has for over twenty years been preoccupied with various aspects of the Potsdam Agreement. Its volume published in 1977, containing the results of the first stage of research, was devoted to the history and the basic legal questions of the Potsdam Conference. Volume two (1987) treated the problem of the pan-German peace regulations and the special legal status of Berlin. The final volume three, here under discussion, analyzes the conference from the point of view of the peaceful order and the European legal order created on the basis of its decisions.

The authors express their authoritative opinions also on matters that go beyond the legal-international plane, as e.g. culture, public opinion or social consciousness in various countries. This opens a field for discussion not only to the lawyers, although they should take it up in the first place.

Lack of space does not allow me to take a stand on all the nine studies contained in the volume¹. I will leave aside those that do not deal with Polish-German matters, but in the first place I should like to bring a certain thread into relief. These are parallels formulated by the authors who compare the consequences of the politics of the Great Powers after World War II in Central Europe and in the Far East. Dieter Blumenwitz perceives the same "ignorance, arrogance and arbitrariness" in territorial decisions with regard to Germany and to Japan, and he accuses the allies of barring in both regions the peaceful order, based on "compensation" (*Ausgleich*) and compromise. The settlement of the frontiers of Germany and Japan, which fell victim to decisions which in Blumenwitz's opinion were unjust, according to the author shows how long the frontier problems may remain open to question. Such is, in his opinion, the still controversial national status of the Kurile Islands and the problem of the Oder-Neisse frontier, solved only from 1990 on, but not regulated backwards. Gilbert Gornig, on the other hand, presents the decisions of the Great Three on China and Korea as an expression of "unprecedented arrogance". The leaders of the USA, Great Britain and the Soviet Union have led, he writes, to the enslavement and division of many nations. They treated them exclusively as objects in the play of interests of the Great Powers and frequently did not even realize what fatal consequences their decisions would have for millions of people. Why do I draw attention to these expositions, whose justness, at least partly, cannot be denied? Because the authors, who, as they stress, managed to discover "with horrifying sharpness" proofs of the tragic arbitrariness of the Great Powers in the documents of the Conference of the Three, perform, as it seems to me, a certain manipulation. They put on the same plane those who started the war — Germany and Japan — and such countries as China and Korea, which were the objects of attack, conquest and cruel occupation. In the above-presented approach everybody — both aggressors and their victims — suffer the same losses as a result of the "unprecedented arrogance" of the leaders of the anti-Nazi coalition. The far-eastern motive, as it seems to me, serves to support the expositions on the significance of the Potsdam Conference for Germany herself — for it suggests that she found herself on the side of the victims of the unjust dictate.

In the context of the conference there appears at the same time another idea which is contrary to historical truth. E.g. Boris Meissner states that the Potsdam Conference took

¹ Boris Meissner, *Die Potsdamer Konferenz: Otto Kimminich, Potsdam und die Frage der Vertreibung. Folgen für Geschichte und Kultur Ost-Mitteleuropas*; Burkhard Schöbener, *Kriegsverbrecherprozesse vor amerikanischen Militärgerichten: die Dachauer Prozesse — Rechtshistorische Bestandaufnahme und Erkenntnisse für zukünftige Kriegsverbrecherprozesse*; Bernhard Kempen, *Potsdam und die deutsch-polnische Grenzregelung*; Dieter Blumenwitz, *Potsdam und die russisch-japanische Grenzregelung*; Gilbert Gornig, *China und Korea als Gegenstand der Beratungen auf den Konferenzen von Kairo, Teheran, Jalta und Potsdam*; Jens Hacker, *Die Interpretation der Drei- und Vier-Mächte-Beschlüsse über Deutschland von 1944/45 durch die UdSSR und DDR*; Alexander Uschakow, *Relikte von Potsdam im Verhältnis zu Polen und Russland*; Horst Glassl, *Die Potsdamer Konferenz und das gegenwärtige Zwischen Europa*; Jürgen Schwarz, *Strukturen des europäischen Sicherheitssystems — 50 Jahre nach Potsdam*.

a course that was disadvantageous to the West, "especially to Germany". The author seems to be saying that Germany in 1945, appeared on the scene of events as a part of the Western World, while in reality it was above all the enemy of the Coalition. The projection of the situation that developed after the war — and only with reference to Western Germany — on the moment of the defeat of the Third Reich in the war that it started, seems unjust regardless of the symptoms of the disintegration of the anti-Nazi camp that were accumulating at that time.

It seems significant of the authors' way of thinking about the place of Germany in Europe that they keep referring to the notion of *Zwischeneuropa*. As Horst Glassl explains, the contemporary "middle-Europe" (*Zwischeneuropa*) should be understood as the countries lying between the Stettin-Trieste line, and "the western boundary of the area of the dense Russian settlement". It should be remembered that this notion is derived from the rightist German geopolitical concepts born in the German Empire and the Weimar Republic, according to which the only decisive poles of Central-Eastern Europe are Germany and Russia. Other Slav nations and states, such as the Polish or Czech ones were regarded as not capable of being independent, and unworthy of being accepted, lying "in-between" (*zwischen*). It was Germany's task to attach them to herself within the framework of *Zwischeneuropa*, in order to build a bulwark against Russia or, in case of another constellation — to use them as links with the Eastern empire. On reading the book one may think that the authors, consciously or unconsciously, move in the orbit not only of terms but also ideas of the German discourse on the architecture of Europe that are part of, it seems, the past that is definitely closed.

The deliberations on the European legal order after 1945 include, on the one hand, the interpretation of the Potsdam agreement and related acts of the allies, on the other they refer to the experiences of the post-war fifty years in the domain of Germany's relations with her Eastern neighbours. A lot of space is devoted to the problem of German frontiers in this region and the set of matters denoted by the term *Vertreibung* (expulsion). These expositions lead among other things to the conclusion that the state of Polish-German relations is much worse than Poles themselves are prone to admit. In the authors' opinion only Poland is to blame for it, since despite the conclusion of agreements on the frontiers, neighbourhood and friendship in the years 1990-1991 the crucial issues continue to remain open.

This above all concerns the question of expulsion. In justification it is said that the leaders of the Great Three in the Potsdam Agreement did not enjoin the expulsion of the German population from Central Europe, nor did they give their consent (*Billigung*) to the expulsion already under way. The Potsdam agreement was not a legal-international act and its decisions had no binding force in terms of international law. The invoking of the decisions of the Great Three by the "expelling states" (*Vertreiberstaaten*) is thus a "historical lie", invented by Poles and Czechs. The enforced expulsion of the German population was generally contrary to international law and constituted a violation of human rights². One of the crucial theses of the book is that the question of compensation for the harm and losses suffered by the German population expelled after the war remains open.

The authors assess the attitude of Poles (and Czechs) very critically also because, despite the partial withdrawal of their lies "the expellers" still do not want to admit their guilt and to apologize for the "lawlessness and inhumanity of the expulsion". Polish declarations with the expressions of regret made by the representatives of the Polish state and society — including the well-known address of the Polish bishops — have been generally acknowledged as not quite sincere (*halbherzige*) and inadequate³. The additional objection against the "restrictive" treatment of the question of German minority in Poland seems to perform an auxiliary function in this argumentation, since the refusal to grant the above-mentioned compensation is — in

² Boris Meissner refers in his study to later regulations, i.e. the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, on the protection of civilians.

³ Polish arguments on this issue are documented in the book *Przeprosić za wypędzenie? Wypowiedzi oficjalne oraz debata prasowa o wysiedleniu Niemców po II wojnie światowej (To Apologize for the Expulsion? Official Statements and the Press Debate on the Expulsion of Germans after World War II)*, ed. by Klaus Bachmann and Jerzy Krańz, Kraków 1997.

the authors' opinion — the decisive proof of the fact that Poles (and also Czechs) are not ready to reconcile themselves with the Germans. It is worth noticing here that no apology or compensation is required from Russia as the successor of the USSR. Russia only appears in the context of the restitution of the objects of German culture. While the fact that Poland has not settled the problem of compensation — the conclusion runs — encumbers considerably both the present Polish–German relations and the perspective of their development in the future.

Is this the only bone of contention between Germans and Poles that is the aftermath of the war? The book does not give an unequivocal answer. In one place it says that the agreements of 1990–1991 solve all the territorial questions between Poland and Germany; in legal terms they have an ultimately binding character⁴. It is, however, possible — it adds in one breath — to carry out a peaceful change of German frontiers without the necessary consent of the Great Powers. The authors' position on the question of the Polish–German frontier can be interpreted like this: it is solved for the present, but it can be re–opened in the future and it continues to be open with reference to the past, since its consequence was the expulsion. At the same time the authors do not mean to give up contesting the legal status of the “Oder–Neisse line” over the post–war 45 years.

As a background to the above views it is worth citing a fragment of the pronouncement by the leader of the Association of Silesian Compatriots in Germany, Herbert Hupka, published in “Dziennik Zachodni” in August 1997. The question whether the settlement of the Oder–Neisse frontier by the treaty will continue to be undermined by the expelled, was answered by him in the following way: “The Helsinki treaties allow for a discussion of this subject. They contain the formula which can be translated as peace and change. I understand it so that even the signed treaties can continue to be peacefully negotiated and changed with the consent of both parties”⁵. It should be added that this statement expresses the current position of the majority of the Union of the Expelled (*Bund der Vertriebenen* — *BdV*). They continue to regard this frontier as lawless, calling for the further struggle for just agreements and “the right settlement” with Poland⁶.

In the light of this book the conference of the Great Powers at Potsdam appears in effect as a collusion of the allies against Germany, concluded in order to harm her lawlessly. The results of research by this group make one doubt that the authors had accepted, as they write, the perspective of “the new political landscape” in Europe formed by the unification of Germany, the disintegration of the communist bloc and the overcoming of the effect of the cold war. It rather seems that their way of thinking is petrified in quite a different “landscape”. While commenting on the peculiar diagnosis of Otto Kimminich, claiming that the mentality and especially morality in the “expelling countries” has been irreparably distorted as a result of effecting the expulsion — which “sheds a grim light on the future of Central and Eastern Europe”⁷, Artur Hajnicz has justly said that for this lawyer, well–known in the circles of the expelled, time has come to a standstill. The same can be said of Horst Glassl, who prophesies that Poles and Czechs will not be able to construct a liberal–democratic order, since they are encumbered with a kind of an original sin of expulsion. The policy of the unified Germany towards Poland provides many proofs of the fact that the position of the relentless milieu of the expelled expressed in the book is, in the opinion of the mentioned Polish lawyer and publicist, “only a slight dissonance to Kohl’s policy of reconciliation with his neighbours and European unity”⁸. Therefore it does not make sense to take up a loud polemic and above all we should not in Poland stoop to the rhetoric of hate.

⁴ Bernhard Kempen's study, p. 87.

⁵ Cit. after “Polityka” № 33 of August 16, 1997, p. 67.

⁶ For a more extensive treatment of the *BdV* policy see: Beata Ociepka, “Walka o lepsze układy trwa nadal”. *Koncepcje traktatowego rozwiązania konfliktu między Polską a RFN w programach i działalności Związku Wypędzonych* (“The Fight for Better Agreements Continues”. *The Proposals for the Solution of the Conflict between Poland and FRG by Way of a Treaty in the Programmes and Activity of the Union of the Expelled*), Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis No 1789, Niemcoznawstwo 6, ed. by Karol Fiedor, Wrocław 1996, pp. 87–127.

⁷ O. Kimminich's study, p. 51.

Concerned about maintaining a favourable atmosphere for the Polish–German rapprochement, following 1989, we have generally devoted less attention in Poland to those milieus in Germany which oppose the policy of normalization. On the other hand, Polish public opinion has more frequently been informed about the voices of the adherents of this policy. As it seems to me, apart from the conscious choice of the strategy of dialogue, this was to a certain extent dictated by a wish to compensate for the damage done by the propaganda of the Polish People’s Republic. It used instrumentally the “syndrome of German threat”, with the revisionist activity of *BdV* as an important element, for the special political purposes of the then regime. Today, eight years after the agreement, when its seeds are yielding a visible crop, we needn’t bother so much, it seems, about the fact that not only the trees of friendship grow in the field of Polish–German relations. These, however, require our constant, mutual concern. For one cannot rule out that they can be stifled again with the thorny bushes of hatred.

Edmund Dmitrów

⁸ Włodzimierz Borodziej, Artur Hajnicz, *Kompleks wypędzenia — raport końcowy (The Complex of Expulsion — Final Report)*, Warszawa, December 7, 1996, p. 57.