

Jakub Morawiec, *Między poezją a polityką: Rozgrywki polityczne w Skandynawii XI wieku w świetle poezji ówczesnych skaldów* [Between Poetry and Politics: Political Games in Scandinavia in the Eleventh Century in the Light of Contemporary Skaldic Poetry of the Period], Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2016, 669 pp., Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego w Katowicach, no. 3430, series Historia

Jakub Morawiec, a lecturer at the Silesian University in Katowice, is an author of many studies devoted to the history of medieval Scandinavia. His research interests focus on topics like the biography of Canute the Great, Slavic-Scandinavian contacts and, above all, skaldic poetry. The book under review is the author's post-doctoral dissertation (to obtain the degree of habilitated doctor) and the summary of his research into skaldic poetry (as the author lists his studies in the bibliography, I feel no obligation to quote them here — p. 646 f.). It is an attempt to provide a broader view of the political history of Scandinavia in the eleventh century through skaldic poems. Morawiec's book is overwhelming only in its length and, above all, the huge erudition of its author. This is why, and because I am not able to comment of all of its range, that the following remarks are quite selective.

First of all, we need to appreciate the fact that the study fills an unquestionable gap in Polish literature on the subject of skaldic poetry. With the exception of the author's earlier contributions, Polish readers have so far had to be satisfied with brief comments in the margins of a few popular works devoted to Icelandic sagas. Morawiec introduces us, in a systematic and competent manner, to the basic problems of skaldic poetry such as its metre, metaphors, genres, its distinction from Eddaic poetry and finally, biographies of its authors (pp. 33–260). He states that for him, the poetry is not an autonomous research subject but rather a source for the study of the period's political history. As a result he has to face several challenges: what are the characteristics of the sources that are of interest to him, to what extent are they reliable and useful in such research? Let us see what answers to these questions have been provided by the author.

Practically the entire corpus of skaldic poetry surviving to this day has done so in the form of scattered verses quoted in more substantial historiographic narratives originating in the twelfth century at the earliest. The oldest known example of this poetry is a couplet insulting the goddess Freya, apparently delivered by Hjalti Skeggjason during a session of the Icelandic Althing in the late tenth century. It is quoted by Ari the Wise in his *Íslendingabók* (Book of

the Icelanders) of 1122–33. This one example — incidentally not included by Jakub Morawiec in his study — shows the huge distance between the original and its literary account: in this particular case a temporal distance of far over one hundred years (not to mention the fact that even the *Íslendingabók* has survived only in much later copies). And what should we say about poems allegedly originating in the times of the first King of Norway, Harald Fairhair (in the ninth to tenth century) but known from thirteenth-century texts? The belief at the time was that on account of the strictness of the metre, their content had been faithfully preserved in its oral transmission. Yet today we know that versification was very much susceptible to change, as is evidenced by the ‘shifts’ found across different versions of the same pieces (pp. 15, 37–42).

Some historians have even challenged the fundamental authenticity of skaldic poetry, claiming that the poems were in fact written by the authors of sagas, who invented words they then attributed to well-known skalds, to put into the mouths of their protagonists. The device was to increase the credibility of their stories. This view has been criticized and firmly rejected by Morawiec (pp. 14, 20 f., 79–90). He maintains that the works of the skalds are rooted in the periods of their established authors and the events which they describe, and thus they enable scholars studying a particular period to speak in an authoritative manner on the subject.

There is another point at issue, namely, whether the verses should be analysed in the context of the accompanying prose (*prosimetrum*) or, on the contrary, whether they are autonomous utterances. The author opts for the latter analysis, de-contextualization. He explains this choice by referring to the discrepancies that may occur between the original author’s intention and later interpretations of the verse by subsequent authors (pp. 13, 15–17, 55–60). Morawiec believes that the new contexts in which the verses function only cause ‘additional confusion’ and hampers scholars’ work (for example pp. 348, 352, 455). However, I would argue that such confusion seems intellectually fruitful, as it enables us to get to know the historical culture of Scandinavia in the high Middle Ages. Moreover, we could even contend that the skaldic verses, even in the imperfect form transmitted to us, might be more ‘authentic’ than those of complete poems ‘prepared’ by modern publishers. In other words, we should focus not on the ‘original’ sense of the verses, but on their later reception and function in the world of the kings’ sagas rather than the historical reality of the early Middle Ages.

Indeed, Morawiec, who refers to ‘hard facts’, cannot escape the historical contexts of skaldic poetry. There is a certain contradiction in his stance. Owing to the scarcity of contemporary sources, the history of early medieval Scandinavia comes to us primarily (though not exclusively) from the kings’ sagas. These are not only late sources but also — as the best specialists have been emphasizing for years — still under-explored in *Quellenforschung*. Above all, however, they are the source of skaldic verses analysed by Morawiec, and these, given their philological and literary specificity, do not by themselves make it

possible to reconstruct the events of, for example, the eleventh century. Without such a reconstruction based on prose sources the highly ambiguous skaldic poetry certainly becomes much more difficult to interpret (as can be seen in the reference to Harald Hardrada's sea voyage from Sweden to Norway, discussed by the author on p. 532 f.). As a result, these scraps of poetry are more usable as a contribution to political history rather than a privileged source for its study.

The extensive introduction dealing with the question of sources is followed by the main body of the book (pp. 263–628). In each chapter the author first introduces the historical context of the events in question and then proceeds to analyse the skaldic verses. He is particularly interested in the way images of various rulers were created in them, and how this shaped the memory of their achievements. This part is divided into seven chapters dealing with fundamental episodes from the history of eleventh-century Scandinavia. These are: the Battle of Øresund (pp. 265–306), the reign of Saint Olaf (1015–30; pp. 307–406) and growth of his cult (pp. 447–524), the conquest of England by Canute the Great (pp. 407–46), attempts by Harald Hardrada (the Hard Ruler) to subjugate Denmark (pp. 525–70) and England (pp. 571–96), and finally the reign of Magnus Barefoot (1093–1103), which the author regards as the end of the Viking era (pp. 597–628). The topics have been selected not so much on the basis of the events' significance, but rather the degree of interest shown in them among the skalds. What is immediately striking (but by no means surprising) is their disproportionate focus on the history of Norway and less so on the history of Denmark, the British Isles and Slavic lands, not to mention Sweden. Another notable feature is a 'missing piece', in the form of the relatively long (1066–93) reign of Olaf the Peaceful.

Grounds for polemics can be found in some of the conclusions and historical interpretations presented in the book. First of all, it is difficult to agree that Olaf Tryggvason (who reigned in 995–1000) 'died a martyr's death' (p. 267). The ruler certainly contributed greatly to the Christianization of Norway and the islands of North Atlantic, and was seen as the one who paved the way for his successor and namesake (analogous to the figure of John the Baptist for Christ). However, I would not overestimate the traces of his cult (such as the title *beatus* found in reference to him in one chronicle — the anonymous *Historia Norwegie* likely dating to the second half of twelfth century), which did not really catch on in the Middle Ages. Nor was his defeat at Øresund regarded as death in a defence of the faith, as for example the later Battle of Stiklastaðir.

Writing about Saint Olaf (who reigned between 1015–30), the author claims that during his stay in England the future king 'actively supported Æthelred, when, in the spring of 1014, the latter began to make efforts to regain power'. On the other hand he notes that according to some scholars the young Olaf may have been supporting the other side, aiding Canute the Great to conquer England, whilst stating arbitrarily: 'there is not even any suggestion of such cooperation' (p. 310). The problem is that there are profound differences in

this respect between source accounts. Some of them do confirm that Olaf supported Æthelred II in his conflict with his brothers and even stood by his side during the Danish invasion. Others — such as William of Jumièges (V, 8) writing just a couple of decades later — claim it was the other way round. I do not wish to settle this debate here; however, we are certainly dealing with two mutually exclusive traditions concerning the relations between Olaf, Canute, and Æthelred and Edmund.¹ This precludes unequivocal interpretations which leave out the sources that contradict their initial thesis.

It is also a pity that the author too short comments on the (in my opinion) sensational information from the twenty-third stanza of Sigvat Þórðarson's *Erfidrápa* (Mournful Poem), that Saint Olaf restored sight to Vladimir the Great (p. 475). A question arises about the circumstances of this event. We know from the historiographic tradition of Rus' that Vladimir lost his sight shortly before his baptism and regained it immediately afterwards.² When it comes to Olaf, some narrative sources say that he was in Rus' during his youth, although this must have been towards the end of Vladimir's reign — far too late for him to have witnessed or taken any part in the prince's conversion (this is more likely for Tryggvason, who was also brought up in Rus'). In addition, Olaf returned to Rus' one year before his martyrdom and was warmly received by Yaroslav the Wise (is it possible that Sigvat's poem has the two rulers of Rus' confused?).

Let us now move to remarks of a different nature. Morawiec's book is generally written in a clear and interesting manner. Sometimes, however, it contains various repetitions, such as the same word occurring in two successive sentences (for example, pp. 84, 154). I have further qualms with some terminological extravagances, such as the use of the word 'postulate' referring to a source fact as opposed to a historical fact (for example, 'postulated humour' — p. 65; 'Olaf Tryggvason's actual or postulated position' — p. 276; 'postulated [...] size of the [...] fleets' — p. 555; 'postulated sainthood' — pp. 167, 473). Terms overused and misused by the author also include 'concept', usually referring to the idea of hierogamy (for example, on p. 139; incidentally, a Polish equivalent, *hierogamia*, of the Greek term *hierogamos* does exist) or 'potential' to describe a hypothetical interpretation of a source (for example, 'potentially authentic' — p. 123; 'potential irony' — p. 589).

The author gives the quotations from source accounts both in the original and in his own translation (p. 14). Such a translating endeavour requires much hard work, which certainly should be appreciated. As a result we get a veritable anthology of the earliest skaldic poetry with scholarly comments. The translations not only provide us with the content of skaldic poems, but also convey their raw style. Unfortunately, this sometimes renders them awkward and hard

¹ See Olav Tveito, 'Olav Haraldssons unge år og relasjonen til engelsk kongemakt. Momenter til et *crux interpretum*', *Collegium Medievale*, 21, 2008, pp. 158–81.

² See for example Jacek Banaszkiwicz, "Podanie bohaterskie" o Mieszku I zanotowane w kronice Galla Anonima (I, 4)', in idem, *Trzy po trzy o dziesiątym wieku*, Cracow, 2014, pp. 262–77.

to understand for an unprepared reader (here I mean the kennings in particular). They would benefit, if not from some literary treatment, then at least from better punctuation. I also wish that the stanzas in the poems had been numbered: this would facilitate reading the discussion about them considerably.

However, these reservations concerning methodology and interpretation do not change the generally positive impression the book under review makes. It is undoubtedly Jakub Morawiec's *opus magnum*, testifying to his extraordinary knowledge of his subject matter. We receive not only a mine of information about skaldic poetry, but also the first such serious contribution to the discussion about the Scandinavian Middle Ages from a Polish medievalist in many years. The book undoubtedly deserves to be published in one of the major conference or Scandinavian languages.

Rafał Rutkowski
(Warsaw)

(Translated by Anna Kijak)
(Proofreading by Yelizaveta Crofts)

Liutprando di Cremona, *De Iohanne papa et Ottone imperatore: Crimini, deposizione e morte di un pontefice maledetto*, translated with introduction and notes by Paolo Chiesa, Florence: Edizioni del Galuzzo per la Fondazione Ezio Franceschini, 2018, lxxv, 126 pp., Per Verba: Testi mediolatini con traduzione, vol. 33

The publication presented and reviewed here is an Italian translation of Liudprand of Cremona's *Historia Ottonis* text, for which Walter Ullmann gave its author the moniker 'biased reporter'.¹ It is a fascinating source on tenth-century conflicts in Italy and particularly in Rome, both due to the subject matter and the way the narrative is constructed. Its author, Liudprand of Cremona, born in Pavia, was one of the most prominent authors of that age. Today he is mainly known for descriptions of contemporary affairs in Constantinople, featured both in his longer chronicle on Europe (*Antapodosis*) and in the oft-cited *Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana*. Liudprand's career is emblematic of Italy in the tenth century. His family was connected to the king's court and at an early age he was in the choir of Hugh of Arles. After a few years he continued in his father's and stepfather's footsteps and worked as ambassador for Hugh's successor, Berengar II. He did not remain in Berengar II's service, since in c. 950 he moved north of the Alps and joined King Otto the Great's court. He remained in Otto's service for the rest of his life until c. 972.

Liudprand wrote all his known texts during the time he served Otto. All apart from *Homilia Paschalis* are regarded as having been written with the

¹ Walter Ullmann, 'The Origins of the *Ottonianum*', *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 11, 1953, 1, pp. 114–28 (p. 124).

court's political interests more or less in mind. Such a view, largely accurate, finds confirmation in the *Historia*, which was written in a very passionate and bi-ased way. In it Liudprand described the conflict between Otto and Pope John XII. Both the narrative and the of this struggle began in 961 when Pope John, afraid of the power of Berengar II and Berengar's son Adalbert, asked Otto for help. This plea was grasped by Otto as an occasion for the advancement of his own political aims. Through alliance with the Pope he acquired an imperial crown in 962. While he was able to rout Berengar's forces, Pope John began to feel uneasy in this new alliance. He soon changed sides and allied with his former enemy Adalbert. When he was informed of this, Otto moved his army to Rome. Having taken hold of it, the Emperor pushed through the deposition of the unfaithful Pope and the election of his own candidate Leo VIII. This was far from the end of the conflict, as after quashing the rebellion in the city Otto returned to pacification of the peninsula. Seeing an opportunity, Pope John returned to the city while Pope Leo took flight. John then organized a council that denounced the decision of the council that deposed him — both had to large extent the same attendance. Pope John died before Otto began a new siege of the city and according to sources he died in unfitting manner. Liudprand remarked that it was after he was punched by the devil whilst Pope John was with certain woman from the city. The conflict continued afterwards as Rome chose Pope Benedict V as Pope John's successor. The end came only after Otto was able to conquer Rome again and send Pope Benedict into exile in Hamburg. Liudprand described all these events in detail and with a great mastery of Latin.

The translation of the *Historia* was prepared by Paolo Chiesa, one of the foremost scholars of Latin historiography. Since at least the early 1990s he has expressed keen interest in Liudprand and his works. In a series of articles and a book, he has proposed returning to an old thesis that the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 6388 manuscript containing the bishop of Cremona's *opus magnum*, *Antapodosis*, was supervised by Liudprand himself.² Soon afterwards Chiesa prepared a new edition of Liudprand's oeuvre. It was published as part of *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis*.³ This edition, now seen as the standard one, was following the series's guidance on textual commentary. Footnotes were therefore limited to the presentation of alternate readings of manuscripts.

This new edition has sparked renewed interest in Liudprand's works and provoked a fresh impetus for translation of his works into modern languages. A complete English translation of his oeuvre was prepared by Paolo Squatriti.⁴ It has a good introduction and a number of footnotes to the text, but it is restrained in its quantity of critical apparatus. Later, François Bougard published

² Paolo Chiesa, *Liudprando di Cremona e il Codice di Frisinga Clm 6388*, Turnhout, 1994, *Corpus Christianorum. Autographa Medii Aevi*, vol. 1.

³ Liudprandus Cremonensis, *Opera Omnia*, ed. Paolo Chiesa, Turnhout, 1998, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediævalis*, vol. 156.

⁴ Liudprand of Cremona, *The Complete Works of Liudprand of Cremona*, transl. Paolo Squatriti, Washington, D.C., 2007.

a French translation of Liudprand's complete works. Bougard also proposed correction to the text prepared by Chiesa. This bilingual edition had an extensive introduction and detailed footnotes concerned with philological and historical matters.⁵ At around the same time Chiesa prepared an Italian translation of *Antapodosis*.⁶ It was likewise published in the bilingual format and complemented by an in-depth commentary and long textual footnotes, explaining and discussing Liudprand's writing.

Now Chiesa has prepared a new translation of the *Historia*, providing us with a new publication on Liudprand's work. This comes in the form of small book which presents a detailed view on the text. The book — which deserves to be commended — contains the original Latin text on the pages facing the translation. It begins with a short introduction presenting the text, the narrative it contains and the recreations of the past that have been done by historians. This introduction does not provide much new information, but serves as a good primer for the reader — even one who is not a scholar of tenth-century affairs.

Following the introduction, there is a concise chronological table presenting all the events discussed in the *Historia* with references to particular chapters. Another short note follows, this time on the Clm 6388, where the main textual witness of the *Historia* is included. *Historia* in it was not edited by Liudprand, as it was added by a different hand to the manuscript sometime after the text of *Antapodosis* was completed.

Chiesa has chosen the unaltered text of his own 1998 edition as the basis for his translation, which together with the Latin text takes up twenty-nine pages. Chiesa's translation is direct, very close to the Latin text but at the same time readable and pleasant. This means that the reader can easily compare the translation to the Latin and, more importantly, use it well in quotations and in the discussion of interpretation of particular expressions by Liudprand. This is important as many recent translations of tenth-century sources stray from the Latin text. It would not be an overstatement that Chiesa shows in this publication his superior knowledge and mastery of Latin. No part of the translation is controversial, or unconvincing. This needs to be highlighted as there are some instances in other recent publications that could be seen as either confusing or even intentionally specious.

While this is easily enough to praise the publication, there is something more that makes Chiesa's work as highly important. The forty-four pages after the translation contain — in much smaller print — in-depth notes to the text. They not only give information on characters appearing in the text, or the particular problem of the interpretation of Latin text, but at times they give brief discussions on Liudprand's writings and their broader questions. These notes both summarize our knowledge of the *Historia* and expand on it. The

⁵ Liudprand, *Liudprand de Crémone. Œuvres*, transl. François Bougard, Paris, 2015, Sources d'histoire médiévale, vol. 41.

⁶ Liutprando, *Antapodosis*, transl. Paolo Chiesa, Milan, 2015, Scrittori greci e latini.

quality and quantity of the author's comments mean that any scholar who is now attempting to write on Liudprand's text should first look into Chiesa's book. The richness of the commentary is even more pronounced in the contrast to rather limited notes present in the English translations of medieval texts, including Squatriti's. It has to be noted that some readers would like to have more commentary on certain elements of the text, for example on the individuals present at the council where the accusations against Pope John were presented. From the reviewer's perspective, collecting information on those present on that occasion and contrasting them with the individuals who sat on Pope John's council would be both practical and helpful. On the other hand, for other readers these additions could seem unnecessary or even bloat the text. Such a situation is unavoidable. Nevertheless, even those who would want to have more notes will have to concede that the current commentary is more than ample. Chiesa next presents an appendix. With a very short introduction he includes there a selection of other witness texts to the conflict between Otto and Pope John. These are, in the publication order: a *Continuation of the chronicle of Regino of Prüm*; Benedict of St Andrew by Monte Soracte's *Chronicon*; Flodoard of Reims's *Annals*; *Liber Pontificalis*; Acts of John XII's council conveyed after he returned to Rome in 964, and finally the *Ottonianum* privilege. This is only a selection of the first three texts where the affair is discussed. Not only is a translation present but the Latin text on which it is based is also included. The presentation of the text is different here, as the translation is not put on pages facing the Latin text but instead follows it directly. The appendices also lack of any form of commentary.

Chiesa's work is something of an exemplary publication on a very specific text. The author provides readers with everything they need regarding the research and discussion of the *Historia*. In many ways this is a complete book that should be seen as a point of reference in later translations of the medieval texts. The minor criticisms from reviewers demonstrate even more the extent to which the book is not only an important publication for the researchers of the tenth century, the papacy and early medieval Germany, but should also serve as a guide for those who want to prepare their own translations of historical sources.

Antoni Grabowski
(Warsaw)

(Proofreading by Yelizaveta Crofts)

Brief und Kommunikation im Wandel: Medien, Autoren und Kontexte in den Debatten des Investiturstreits, edited by Florian Hartmann, Cologne, Weimar and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2016, 401 pp., Papsttum im mittelalterlichen Europa, vol. 5

Leidulf Melve published an important and excellent book over ten years ago and dealt with a material issue: namely the role of writings and documents recorded during the great controversy between secular and ecclesiastical authority in the eleventh century (*Inventing the Public Sphere: The Public Debate during the Investiture Contest (c. 1030–1122)*, 2 vols, Leiden and Boston, MA, 2007). The researcher thoroughly analysed various treatises and writings, many of which were published in the MGH series *Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum*. The book under review is essentially a complementary research of material partly omitted by Melve, though it should be emphasized that the Norwegian historian has written extensively about output of both the pope's and the emperor's chancellery, the correspondence between the parties of the dispute, as well as numerous letters of the proponents and opponents of the Holy See's activities. We should remember, however, that in the eleventh century great ecclesiastical reform letters often resembled developed treatises, full of arguments which — regardless of the addressee — were in fact addressed to a wide circle of recipients.

We should start from questions related to the title of the book. The studies collected herein are intended to relate to social communication at the time of the investiture contest, whereas in fact many of the included authors deal with sources from a period much earlier than Gregory VII's pontificate. The reform of the Church began at the turn of the millennium and popes had naturally been deeply involved in this since the pontificate of Leon IX; however 'investiture contest' is a very precise term which relates to particular activities and events. The issue of Henry IV's excommunication and subsequent humiliation in Canossa dominated German historiography of the eleventh century, but a synonymous definition of the so called Gregorian reform as '*Investiturstreit*' is cause for confusion; many national historiographies have ceased to use the two terms interchangeably. We need to revise the perception of the causal and temporal relationship between the ban on investiture and the struggle between the empire and the papacy. This prohibition, which came into force as late as 1077–80 (not earlier!), was the consequence of fundamental conflict between both powers (*prophetisches Sacerdotium* and *heilsgeschichtliches Regnum*), not the reason of this contest. The Church dealt with the problem as late as 1077, when papal legate Hugo from Die announced the ban on investiture for France during the synod in Autun and next year in Poitiers. In autumn of 1078 a general decree was published in Rome against acceptance of investiture by secular authorities, and the Lenten synod of 1080 repeated the ban and extended it to those granting investiture. This is why as far as Gregory VII's pontificate is concerned, the term *Investiturstreit* should not be used at all. It is not simply a terminological discussion; we should take into account a very important

problem: the real goals of papal reforms. If we do not answer this question, the research presented in this book may not bring a satisfying answer. Until recently, the historiography has opted for the opinion that Gregory VII's primary intent was to deprive secular authorities of influence on the Church. According to this view, the policy of the Holy See in the second half of the eleventh century aimed mainly at *libertas ecclesiae* — but it is accepted that this term did not equate to the exclusion of secular influence but rather included secular rulers in the reform. The reformers did not want strictly to separate the ecclesiastical and secular realms but to re-define the Holy See's position. Contrary to Simony and Nicolaism, opposed by many of Gregory VII's predecessors, the idea of the ban on investiture by rulers emerged gradually only during his pontificate.

The collective monograph presented is an output of the conference and vivid discussion which took place in Bonn in 2014. It contains sixteen detailed chapters and two texts by Florian Hartmann: one introducing the subject of research and the other summarizing studies contained in the book. In the first of these ('Kommunikation im Wandel: Medien, Autoren und Kontexte in den Debatten des Investiturstreits: Eine Einführung', pp. 9–21) the historian emphasized a point clear to most medievalists, namely that the eleventh century was a turning point in the history of the western middle ages and more broadly, western civilization. He mentioned several elements which were most significantly symptomatic of this, such as the Gregorian reforms of the Church, contentions over investiture, the struggle between *regnum* and *sacerdotium*, and political turmoil in the Reich. Hartmann is clearly aware that the issue of investiture has already been relativized especially by German historiography, not as the reason for contention but its consequence, yet the *Investiturstreitfrage* (p. 10) is clearly a symbol of changes in the eleventh century for him. I cannot agree with such an approach; we might as well consider the Crusades, the first large-scale and independent European initiative of the Holy See, as symbols of the Gregorian reform. Looking through the prism of the consequences of great change may obscure the picture of causation and circumstance. The author also mentions numerous research areas in which scholars have had only marginal interest, especially given the context of events and phenomena which dominated the epoch, such as Canossa. These areas include the means and tools of the communication by the parties to present their demands, the range of information distribution, innovative propaganda methods, and, last but not least, the transferral of the debate conducted within the closed circle of those directly involved, to the public arena. In other words, we should re-analyse letters, treatises, hagiographies, chronicles in order to answer the question of who was the intended audience of the content of these texts. Obviously written propaganda and journalism were some of the forms of effective social communication and they were mastered thanks to increased mobility, a manifestation of which was the participation of local hierarchs from the mid-eleventh century in Roman synods and a demand for personal receipt of pallium by archbishops and, at the same

time, legations and the forwarding of information at local synods. Among numerous types of polemical writings which came out of the epoch of the Gregorian revolution, letters, both those ostensibly 'private', addressed to individual recipients, and the public *epistolæ vagantes*, play an important role.

In the summary ('Kommunikation im Wandel: Ergebnisse, Ausblick und Desiderate', pp. 381–91) Hartmann mentions three large arenas in which we may place the research contained in the book: communication and dialogue, tradition and novelty, and arguments, authorities and addressees. Post-conference works have clearly not exhausted the problem, and I do not refer only to specific texts and their authors but to whole research areas. So the author puts forward several interesting research proposals: for example, how we should study the influence of written demands on the recipients of these letters and their circle of co-workers. How do we detect the real recipient of a given letter — in other words, whether it was addressed to particular person or was in fact a form of open letter to the public? What was the impact of different written forms, such as letters and collections of canon law, on each other? Finally, the most difficult questions: what goal was achieved through these means of argument? What were the initial goals of their authors? And in what way were the appropriate arguments, examples and rhetorical devices supposed to affect recipients?

Both Hartmann's texts present in a clear and coherent way a very interesting research problem: letters and their role in the development of public and social communication. But the content of the book is more varied than simply this; other forms of writing, not only letters, are the subject of inquiry. On one hand, this adds value — thanks to these studies we get a wider picture of the public debate at a time of great change surrounding the Church and western European civilization; on the other, it raises a material weakness, because by including other forms of written message in the debate — including codification of canon law — we lose track of the specifics of the sources, which is the authors' central interest. The authorities referred to by medieval authors play a specific role in hagiographic works, a different role in the study of canon law, and another one still in letters — and we should take into account a fundamental difference between private letters and those addressed to a wider circles of recipients.

Another article which handles the subject is a precursor to the recent 'revisionist' research on investiture. It is written by the author of the seminal book on this conflict, Rudolf Schieffer (*Die Entstehung des päpstlichen Investiturstreits für den deutschen König*, Stuttgart, 1981). Schieffer has clearly summarized and recapitulated the research regarding this problem within the last 150 years, showing particular interest in the development of research, and the impact of this on medieval historiography in general ('Deutungen des Investiturstreits', pp. 23–41). But most valuable in the book under review are the dissertations on the kind of sources named in its title: letters, and the means and forms of communication. Thomas Wetzstein ('Von der Unmöglichkeit zu kommunizieren: Briefe, Boten

und Kommunikation im Investiturstreit', pp. 43–68) rightly states that the eleventh century was crucial for development of social communication, since it was at this time that ways of communication and the contexts in which communication was carried out solidified. He has chosen a mixed form of social communication as the subject of his research; specifically, oral transmission of written communications. He emphasizes that a large part of the communication of messages of the period has been lost to modern researchers, since messengers and legates complemented the written messages of their masters with the delivery of an oral message. Oliver Münsch focuses on another aspect of impacting public opinion, the dissemination of rumours, which — when written down — had a far greater range of audiences and reached distant circles of recipients ('Gerüchte und ihre Verbreitung: Beobachtungen zur Propaganda im Investiturstreit', pp. 69–90). As far as methodological issues are concerned, Christian Heinrich's discussion regarding a new definition of the *libelli de lite* type, that is, polemical writings, is worth mentioning (pp. 91–102).

Many of the studies focus on specific authors or their chancelleries. We have here comparative studies regarding Henry IV's letter formulae and those of his successor Henry V — in contrast to his father, who often addressed his letters to individual recipients, Henry V treated his correspondence as public and addressed it to all his subjects (Gerhard Lubich, pp. 129–45) — alongside research on strategies of communication with both sides of the dispute by Bishop Hezilon of Hildesheim (Matthias Schrör, pp. 147–55), and an attempt to describe the relations of the archbishops of Canterbury with English kings (Roland Zingg, pp. 157–74). Nicolangelo D'Acunto's research relating to the form and types of arguments used in the extensive correspondence of Peter Damiani ('Brieftradition und Argumentationsformen in den Briefen Petrus Damianis', pp. 261–70) deserves particular attention. The Italian scholar has hitherto dealt only with selected communication 'tricks' used by the prior of Fonte Avellana, not exhausting the subject, so it is worthwhile to complement his line of reasoning with several commentaries. The reformer left 180 letters, of which only a small part is the private correspondence addressed to individual recipients and concerning specific matters. The majority of it consists of epistolary treatises and hagiographies, letters, *consuetudines*, and such like, which even where they had an addressee, were in fact addressed to large groups of recipients (monks, nuns, reformers, Church hierarchs and the lay public), and played either a polemic or pastoral role. A good example of the problems with the identification of recipients surfaces with the first preserved letter of Peter Damiani, *Contra Iudæos* written circa 1400. It is an extensive work, partly a treatise and partly a dispute, addressed to a certain Honestus to provide him with arguments in the case that he should have to debate with Jews. Many researchers believe that Honestus is a fictional person, and the real audience and recipients of the letter were clergymen, who would at some point have encountered and confronted Jewish debaters. In fact, Damiani probably addressed his letter to yet another set of recipients, since he wanted to introduce himself to the nar-

row circle of church reformers through a display of his theological skills, skills of reasoning, use of arguments, knowledge of Bible and the writings of the Fathers of the Church. This renders the subject of the treatise unimportant, the main point being the presentation of the great skills of a youthful author.

The final group of contributions relate to the various arguments used by parties to the conflicts. For example, Anja-Lisa Schroll describes how memory about bishop Kadalus's schism was used in the period of a subsequent schism, both by the followers of Gregory VII and the anti-Pope Wibert (pp. 295–318). Klaus Herbers shows the way in which reformers made use of the ninth century papal authority, including Nicholas I (pp. 319–34). Lotte Kéry analyses collections of canon created at the time of Church reform and attempts to answer who was the audience, whose instruments were they, and were all of them ultimately tools of the Holy See (pp. 335–80).

Contrary to the title, the chapters contained in this book do not relate exclusively to the debate connected with investiture; they also deal with much earlier phenomena. But their common feature is describing the process which in English is defined by the term *epistolary turn*. The uniqueness of 'the long eleventh century' and its significance in forming the modern civilization of the West is also demonstrated in the studies which were presented in Bonn. The problem which remains to be researched and analysed is to what extent letters created in the period of interest in were 'real' writings; to what extent, how quickly and why did they become a stylistic and content model for other authors, and to what extent they were initially created as a voice and pattern to be used in public debate, both with respect to their content, ways of argument and style. The letters of the aforementioned Peter Damiani are an excellent example of such ambiguous epistolary activity. 'Epistolary turn' of the eleventh century may be better understood only in a wider context of the historical development of these types of sources, and the methodology of research which has been done on them. This is why important supplementary reading for the book under review should be the studies, predominantly methodological, contained in the book *Medieval Letters: Between Fiction and Document*, edited by Christian Høgel and Elisabetta Bartoli (Turnhout, 2015).

It is obvious that letters, both private and open, as well as collections of these, played an important role in the first public debate of medieval Europe. Those involved in this dispute learned how to use arguments in the public area and how to win over the public opinion. Heated, sometimes dramatic conflict created, thanks to the use of reasoned and often legal arguments, the intellectual climate of the twelfth-century Renaissance. The studies which have been gathered in this book bring us one step closer to understanding the phenomenon of the fundamental societal changes of the eleventh century.

Krzysztof Skwierczyński
(Warsaw)

(Translated by Elżbieta Petrajtis-O'Neill)
(Proofreading by Yelizaveta Crofts)

Kronika halicko-wołyńska: (Kronika Romanowiczów) / Chronica Galiciano-Voliniana: (Chronica Romanoviciana), edited, introduced and annotated by Dariusz Dąbrowski, Adrian Jusupović, in collaboration with Irina Juriewa, Aleksander Majorow and Tatiana Wiłkuł, Cracow and Warsaw: Polska Akademia Umiejętności; Instytut Historii PAN, 2017, CXXVII + 709 pp. + 16 colour copies of pages from the manuscript, Pomniki Dziejowe Polski, Seria 2 / Monumenta Poloniæ Historica, Series nova, vol. 16

Kronika halicko-wołyńska: Kronika Romanowiczów [The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle: The Dynasty Chronicle of the Romanovichi], translation, introduction and commentary Dariusz Dąbrowski and Adrian Jusupović, Cracow: Avalon; Warsaw: Instytut Historii PAN, 2017, 327 pp. (text of the manuscript pp. 91–272)

Over 150 years after August Bielowski's call in the inaugural volume of the Monumenta Poloniæ Historica series to publish the original text of the *Volhynian Chronicle* with a Polish translation and commentary, the Polish humanities have now received — thanks to a grant from the National Science Centre — two separate volumes, issued by two different publishers and featuring a critical scholarly edition and a translation of this historic work. The task of editing the work was taken on by two eminent experts on medieval Rus': Dariusz Dąbrowski, professor of the Casimir the Great University of Bydgoszcz, author of over 100 studies, including four books, mostly devoted to Galician-Volhynian Rus',¹ and the initiator and author of the edition, Adrian Jusupović from the Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History of the Polish Academy of Sciences, a scholar with many outstanding achievements to his credit.² The two editors invited Irina Iur'eva from the Russian Language Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Aleksandr V. Maiorov from Saint Petersburg University, and Tetiana Vilkuł from the Institute of Archaeography of the National Academy of Sciences, Ukraine, to collaborate with them on the project and support them with their specialist knowledge in the study of the manuscripts and preparation of detailed interpretations of many aspects debated in the literature on the subject.

¹ Dariusz Dąbrowski, *Rodowód Romanowiczów, książąt halicko-wołyńskich*, Poznań and Wrocław, 2002; idem, *Genealogia Mściśławowiczów: Pierwsze pokolenia (do początku XIV wieku)*, Cracow, 2008; idem, *Daniel Romanowicz król Rusi (ok. 1201–1264): Biografia polityczna*, Cracow, 2012; idem, *Król Rusi Daniel Romanowicz: O ruskiej rodzinie książęcej, społeczeństwie i kulturze w XIII w.*, Cracow, 2016 <<https://ukw.academia.edu/DariuszDąbrowski>> [accessed 8 May 2018].

² The bibliography of Adrian Jusupović until 2015 comprises forty studies, mostly devoted to Rus' in the Middle Ages, including the book *Elity ziemi halickiej i wołyńskiej w czasach Romanowiczów (1205–1269): Studium prozopograficzne*, Cracow, 2013 <<https://ihpan.academia.edu/AdrianJusupović>> [accessed 8 May 2018].

The *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, subtitled by Dąbrowski and Jusupović *The Dynasty Chronicle of the Romanovichi*, is well-known to specialists and occupies an important place in historical literature. It is a fragment of a number of surviving manuscript compilations from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries, comprising *The Tale of Bygone Years* (also known as the *Primary Chronicle* or *Nestor's Chronicle*), the most famous historic piece of Old Russian writing, covering the period until 1111 (6618 of the Russian era); its chronological continuation, the *Kievan Chronicle*, ending in 1198 (6706 or 6708); and the chronicle of the present edition, covering events from the thirteenth century, beginning with the death of Roman Mstislavovich in 1205 and ending in 1298. Among the compilations in question the oldest is the so-called *Hypatian/Ipatievski Codex*, a manuscript from the early 1420s, published since 1843 in several editions widely used by scholars. They include two editions of the second volume in the series *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* (Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles — PSRL), from 1843 and Aleksei A. Shakhmatov's 1908 critical edition, reissued three times in 1962, 1998 and 2001, as well as a separate 1871 edition of the entire codex, reissued in 2001. Versions of the text of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* differing from the *Hypatian Codex* present in scholarly circulation are less popular. There is also the 1990 Harvard University phototypical edition, published together with the *Kievan Chronicle*, from poor quality microfilms of the Khlebnikov-Ostrogski Manuscript and the Pogodinskii Manuscript, and Mykola F. Kotliar's 2002 edition based on the Harvard edition. What undoubtedly justifies the need for a new critical edition of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* is not only the fact that Shakhmatov's 1908 edition, although valuable, does not meet modern scholarly requirements, but above all a significant defect in the manuscript on which the edition is based. As early as in 1901 Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi concluded that all studies should be based not on the chronologized *Hypatian Codex* but on other texts (Khlebnikov, Pogodinskii), which, although originating centuries later, are closer to the archetype (p. VIII). As it turns out, the text of the *Chronicle* lacks a chronological continuation of the narrative, which, according to Dąbrowski and Jusupović, was the reason why the copyist making the Hypatian Manuscript in the fifteenth century introduced a division into years, because a 'formula without a division into years was alien and unacceptable to him' (p. XLIX).

Following this train of thought and thanks to their in-depth knowledge of the literature on the subject as well as previous editions of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, Dąbrowski and Jusupović have established that the text of the *Chronicle* has survived in seven paper manuscript compilations from the fifteenth to the nineteenth centuries. Three of them also feature, in addition to the chronicles in question, other works: *The Tale of St Peter Metropolitan of Kiev*, fragments of *The Book of Esther* and *The Tale of the Mamay Battlefield*. The traditional, often strange-sounding names of the manuscripts come either from the names of the owners or places where they were discovered or kept. The manuscripts studied for the present edition are: (1) the afore-mentioned Hypatian Manuscript (*Ipat'evskii spisok*, kept in the Library of the Russian

Academy of Sciences in Saint Petersburg, no. 16.4.4), made at the beginning of the 1420s; (2) the Khlebnikov-Ostrogski Manuscript (*Khlebnikovskii-Ostrozhs-kii spisok*, kept in Saint Petersburg, in the Russian National Library — RNL, no. F.IV.230) made in the late 1550s and early 1560s, and supplemented in 1637; (3) the Pogodinskii-Czetwertyński manuscript (*Pogodinskii spisok*, also from the RNL, no. Flor. 1401) completed in 1621, which is a copy of the Khlebnikov Manuscript; (4) the Bundur/Jarocki Manuscript (*Spisok Ia.V. Iarotskogo*, kept in the Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Saint Petersburg, no. 21.3.14) written down in 1651 by Marko Bundur, a monk from the Monastery of St Nicholas in Kiev; (5) the Ermolaevskii Manuscript (*Ermolaevskii spisok*, kept in the RNL in Saint Petersburg, no. F.IV.231) made in 1711 in the Pechersk Lavra in Kiev; (6) the Cracow Manuscript, a copy of the Pogodinskii manuscript in the Latin alphabet from around 1782–92, commissioned by Adam Naruszewicz and kept in the Princes Czartoryski Library in Cracow (BC, no. 122); (7) the RGADA Manuscript (Russian State Archives of Historical Records, no. F.181.10), made by Petr Bol'shakov in 1814–16, a copy of the entire *Hypatian Chronicle*.

Dąbrowski and Jusupović carried out a detailed analysis of the first five manuscripts from the Southern Rus'ian collections, studying them directly in libraries and then continuing their research on modern electronic copies precisely reproducing the originals. On this basis they have formulated a hypothesis whereby the surviving historic works of Southern Rus'ian historiography are in their entirety (together with a list of Kievan princes until the capture by Kiev by Batu Khan, *The Tale of Bygone Years*, *Kievan Chronicle* and *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*) a product of the Romanovichs' scriptorium (p. LXXIV). The *stemma codicum* drawn up for the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* by the editors indicates that that a collection compiled in the Romanovichs' milieu or its copy gave rise to a manuscript (protograph), two separate versions of which became, respectively, the protograph of the Hypatian and Khlebnikov Manuscripts (and the latter's later copies, the Pogodinskii-Czetwertyński and Cracow Manuscripts), and the protograph of the Bundur/Jarocki and Ermolaevskii Manuscripts. Some other, now lost, copies were used in the seventeenth century — as is evidenced by the surviving fragments — by the Metropolitan of Kiev Iosif Tryzna and Hegumen of the Monastery of St Michael in Kiev, Feodosii Sofonovych.

Following Hrushevs'kii's old suggestion, Dąbrowski and Jusupović have chosen the Khlebnikov Manuscript as the basis of their edition. The manuscript must have originated in Prince Konstantyn Ostrogski's circle, on the basis of a protograph kept in the Monastery of the Dormition of the Mother of God in Leshch near Pinsk from where it found its way to Kiev and in early 1621 to Zhyvotov, the estate of Prince Stefan Czetwertyński, where a copy subsequently known as the Pogodinskii-Czetwertyński Manuscript was made. Next it must have found its way to Pechersk Lavra, where it was used by Petro Mohyla and Sylvester Kossov, as is evidenced by their notes. The choice of the Khlebnikov Manuscript was preceded by thorough studies of the content and form of the surviving manuscripts, from which the editors concluded that the protograph

was a historiographic collection referred to in the Middle Ages as the *Rus'ian Chronicle*. Its third part is the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*.

The editors' next task was to establish the genre of the work, above all to determine whether we are dealing with a classic old Rus'ian chronicle (*letopis'*). To this end Dąbrowski and Jusupović used the latest model developed by Timofei V. Gimon as well as studies by Aleksei A. Gippius, Tat'iana A. Kruglova and Gelian M. Prokhorov, which show that the content of a *letopis'* is divided by year, and that within a given year there is no single core of the narrative. In addition, a *letopis'* is open to transformations and additions (compilations), and individual authorship is not expressed (p. XLIX). In this light the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* is not a *letopis'*, because its text is not divided by year. It is composed of separate modules, often constituting self-contained wholes. In addition, the narrative often recurs to specific threads, which creates a complex structure of cause-and-effect determinants. Therefore, Dąbrowski and Jusupović have concluded, drawing on Elisabeth Van Houts' findings, that its genre is that of a court (dynastic) chronicle focusing on one princely family.

The chronicle describes the history of five generations of the family, beginning with its progenitor, Roman Mstislavovich. Its protagonists are Feodora, Helena, Daniil and Vasyl'ko Romanovich, Iraklii, Lev, Roman, Mstislav (I), Shvarno and Mstislav (II) Danilovich, Ol'ga and Vladimir Vasyl'kovich, in the fourth generation Iurii L'vovich and Daniil Mstislavovich and in the fifth — Mikhail Iur'evich. Further detailed reflection on the authorship of the *Chronicle* and place of Galician chronicles in Southern Rus'ian historiography is based on an impressive overview of the literature on the subject. It has proved impossible to name the copyists and authors of the analysed work, but the editors have come up with their own interpretation of the structure of its content. In their opinion the *Chronicle* consists of two basic parts: 1) *Court Chronicle of Daniil Romanovich*, with two editions: the first originating around 1246–47, and the second covering the following period until 1258, with a continuation until the second half of 1264; 2) *Volhynian Chronicle*, covering the period from 1258 to around 1298, edited two or three times, as Dąbrowski and Jusupović have managed to establish. The first edition must have originated in Vasyl'ko Romanovich's milieu in the late 1260s, the second at the court of his son, Vladimir Vasyl'kovich, covering the period until early 1289, and the third, a continuation, may have been linked to the milieu of Mstislav (II). As a dynastic chronicle, the *Chronicle* lists many names of people serving the Romanovichs; it also presents the history of the neighbouring countries: Lithuania, the Polish principalities, Hungary, Austria and the Horde.

The present editors have decided to leave the commonly used derivative 'Galician-Volhynian' in the title, noting, however, that the term can be used, contrary to tradition, only in the sense that it is a court chronicle linked to the Romanovichs' state — Galician-Volhynian Rus'. That is why Dąbrowski and Jusupović have proposed their own original name for the publication, *The Dynasty Chronicle of the Romanovichs*. However, to avoid the chaos resulting from a rejection of traditional

names and their replacement with new ones, they have decided to use the term only as a subtitle. Agreeing with the editors, I hope that the name will nevertheless come to be appreciated in historiography.

The editors' ambition was to provide a critical edition preserving the specificity of the medieval text, which, with the help of modern technology and procedures, has made it possible to render the original in print as faithfully as possible. The text of the present edition is based on the Khlebnikov Manuscript, which the editors believe best conveys the nature of the chronicle, written at the court of the Romanovichs in the thirteenth century. The entire codex, written in half-uncial script, comprises 386 paginated + 9 unpaginated folios, with the *Chronicle* to be found on folios 303–384v. That the manuscript attracted much interest is evidenced by numerous comments, including those by five authors from 'Latin circles', people writing in Polish and Latin from the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries, and at least four persons using Cyrillic script from between the sixteenth and second half of the eighteenth century. Colour scans of the manuscript, made to reproduce the manuscript as faithfully as possible, have made it possible to precisely read all marginal notes and emphases.

The edition uses the Litopys New Roman font, which is a version, prepared by Ukrainian IT specialists, of the Times New Roman typeface commonly used in the humanities. The Ukrainian font makes it possible to edit the text both in Cyrillic and Latin scripts. An advantage of the font is a possibility of printing all Cyrillic letters found in the analysed manuscripts with the exception of the letter 'shta', differing from the modern Russian letter 'щ' in that the descender, instead of being found at the end of the letter, is in all manuscripts an extension of the middle leg below the base line 'и'. It has been replaced with 'щ'. Another exception is the letter 'z', not available in the Litopys New Roman font, but editable in Times New Roman, which causes no complications because of the presence of the font in all basic versions of Word. Here the editors have replaced 'z' with 'z', also present in the published manuscripts. As a reviewer and drawing on my own experience I must note the editors' veritably Benedictine meticulousness. Contrary to what they claim, the Litopys New Roman font is by no means stable and additional characters, like 'iotated a' and the ligature '8', turn into 'æ' and 'γ' when the text is transferred to another file or another computer. As we read the critical edition in question we find practically no such errors, which cannot, unfortunately, be said about the translation published by Avalon, in which sloppy proofreading detracts from the work of the editors.

The critical edition is additionally supported by a grammatical description as well as lexical and syntactical specification of the work (pp. XCVII–CXVII) by Irina Iur'eva translated by Jusupović. As research into the language of the *Chronicle* is by no means advanced, this extremely important article provides considerable philological help to scholars without such competence. Linguistically, Iur'eva distinguishes two different works in the text, which is why the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* cannot be viewed as one source. The 'Galician' part, written in Daniil Romanovich's circle, bears a similarity to the archaic *Tale of*

Bygone Years with its literary (Church Slavonic) forms and structures, while the 'Volhynian' part is full of manifestations of the vivid language of the *Kievan Chronicle*.

Thus when working on the critical edition, its authors had to prepare the text of the Khlebnikov-Ostrogski Manuscript, marking a divisions into folios/pages and within them into lines of the original. The editors have also preserved the emphases and notes found in the manuscript. In their publication they have striven to observe the editing instructions of Adam Wolff and follow the guidelines of Dmitrii S. Likhachev and Oleg V. Tvorogov. In addition, they have taken into account the practice recently followed by the editors of new volumes in the series *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica* and *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. However, they have also drawn on their own experiences stemming from the specificity of the manuscripts. This is especially valuable, because the rapid development of information technologies makes it possible to avoid any modernization of the script, which frees scholars from the need to refer to the manuscript. What does arouse some doubts, however, is the modernization of the punctuation and spelling, in accordance with the rules of modern Russian. The editors note that in the case of the Hypatian, Khlebnikov and Pogodinskii Manuscripts the method is not objectionable. In their view it can be debatable in the case of the Bundur/Jarocki and Ermolaevskii Manuscripts, whose authors were influenced by the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Polish and Ukrainian spelling. If we follow Dąbrowski's and Jusupović's arguments that in all cases we are dealing with medieval Southern Rus'ian writings, we can speak only of an editorial tradition developed in Russia in connection with the editions of *The Tale of Bygone Years* and other historic examples of Church Slavonic writings from Rus'. On the other hand, when it comes to the question of the local language, what I find more convincing is the view that already in the Late Middle Ages there existed a clear division into the Great Russian and Western Russian language areas.³ Southern Rus'ian writings undoubtedly belong to the Western language area, which is by no means uniform in linguistic and literary terms. I agree with Iur'eva that the text of the *Chronicle* belongs to that area as well. That is why I find the introduction of yers in square brackets in place of *paerki* and after overridden consonants, in accordance with the Russian spelling, objectionable. Taking into account the phonetic differences between modern Ukrainian and Russian, I am not sure which yer should be placed after a overridden letter. This is debatable, but it seems that instead of adding yers it is better to write the overridden letters in italics. The editors have also explained all conventional abbreviations and at the same time have trusted the reader's competence regarding numerals written in short as letters under the titlo. While in the introduction numerals are given in full, in the edited text of the manuscript and references (philological footnotes) they are not.

³ Andrash Zoltan [András Zoltán], *Iz istorii russkoi leksiki*, Budapest, 1987, p. 13.

Despite this minor reservation, the present edition of the *Chronicle* should be regarded as a model example. Dąbrowski and Jusupović have added appropriate back matter to the literally published text of the Khlebnikov Manuscript. After the text of the *Chronicle* the reader will find all varieties of spelling from the other four manuscripts from the fifteenth-eighteenth centuries — Hypatian, Pogodinskii-Czetyrtyński, Bundur/Jarocki and Ermolaevskii — which even include the spelling of words by means of other letters rendering the same sounds (doublets), for example oy–ŏ–y, ѣ–e and so on. as well as words or phrases missing from the Khlebnikov Manuscript, inversions and different versions of names of places and people. There are also dates introduced by the author of the Hypatian Manuscript. Below, usually at the bottom of the page, we will find footnotes marked with Arabic numerals and featuring comments explaining the text. They include information, if available, about the individuals appearing in the text, with references to the literature about them. The same applies to all geographical names and place names, with editors referring the reader to studies explaining their role in the period in question. Particularly valuable are explanations concerning the events described in the chronicle with attempts to establish their actual chronology, which in the light of the findings relating to the structure of the *Chronicle*, whose authors often return to matters described earlier, helps the reader to understand the text. In total, there are over 1600 footnotes, with the number of philological notes being certainly several times higher.

It is good that Dąbrowski and Jusupović have been able to provide their readers with a Polish translation of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* alongside its critical edition. The translation published by Avalon repeats the main part of the introduction to the critical edition with the exception, of course, of the philological commentary. The translation is directly from the Khlebnikov Manuscript collated with the above mentioned four manuscripts from the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries. However, unlike in the critical edition here it has proved necessary to choose a specific version of words and phrases regarded by the editors as correct or best conveying the meaning of the text. Every translation is an interpretation. However, the translators should be praised for the fact that they have marked the changes introduced in comparison with the Khlebnikov Manuscript in italics. This also applies to the use, also quoted in the introduction to the critical edition, of the name Dnieper (p. 108, fol. 315/645 of the Khlebnikov Manuscript), although the reference is clearly to the Dniester, written in the translation in italics (p. 130 and footnote 363). What facilitates reading for people having problems with reading the Cyrillic script or just beginning to study the script and the language of the sources is the preservation in the translation of the structure of the text, division into folios/pages and lines of the original, which makes it possible to read both volumes in parallel. The translation successfully attempts to remain as faithful as possible to the linguistic and literary specificity of the text. Its authors have decided not to modernize the language to make it more understandable to the Polish reader. Names of people and places have been Polonized, whenever traditional equivalents exist in Polish. I am also grateful to Dąbrowski and Jusupović for pre-

servicing the Eastern Slavic ending of ‘-ич’ in the patronymics instead of the forgotten Polish ‘-ic’, even with reference to Western Slavs, which was and still is quite exotic, for example in studies by Jan Tęgowski devoted to the Gediminovich (Giedyminowicz) dynasty or studies by Dąbrowski himself, where the dynasty is referred to as the Romanovichs (Romanowicze), but in the text we find Roman Mstislavic (Mścislawic), Daniil Romanovic (Romanowic) and so on. in the light of the sources in which they appear. The footnotes to the Polish translation of the chronicle make up a separate study. They contain information about the dates found in the Hypatian Manuscript, explanations concerning the Biblical literature widely quoted in the *Chronicle*, documents of the names of places, people and events as well as fragments of the texts, terms used and so on, which Polish readers will find difficult to understand according to the translators. At the same time, in tracing literary references the two scholars do not go too far, as sometimes happens in the case of their too inquisitive colleagues. For example (p. 161, footnote 709), the phrase ‘lom’ kopeiny’, translated as ‘breaking of the spear’, regarded in the literature as a borrowing from the *Kievan Chronicle*, is, according to the translators, a description of concrete actions by means of similar sets of words.

Unfortunately, the translation of *The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle: The Dynasty Chronicle of the Romanovichi*, unlike the critical edition, is characterized by less meticulous proofreading (quite numerous examples of the ‘iotated a’ and the ligature ‘8’ are rendered by means of incorrect characters). Nevertheless, in both cases we are dealing with a perfect publication, deserving the highest praise as a publication of historiographic sources.

Krzysztof Pietkiewicz
(Poznań)

(Translated by Anna Kijak)

Proces beginek świdnickich w 1332 roku: Studia historyczne i edycja łacińsko-polska [The 1332 Trial of the Beguines of Świdnica: Historical studies and a Latin-Polish edition], edited by Paweł Kras and Tomasz Gałuszka OP, translated by Adam Poznański, Lublin: Wydawnictwo Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 2017, 292 pp. + 5 ill.

Lay religious movements, including the communities of the Beguines and Beghards, are one of the most intriguing aspects of medieval piety. The number of publications and concepts explaining this social and religious phenomenon is huge. One of the most basic problems facing scholars is the limited and often quite one-sided source base. Municipal sources do contain numerous references to Beguine and Beghard houses, which shows the popularity and scale of the phenomenon, but there are far fewer sources providing an insight into the life of these communities. If such sources do exist, they usually pertain to court trials.

Their interpretation poses a fundamental question concerning the objectivity and determinants of the testimonies. One such source has been examined and edited by three scholars: Paweł Kras, Tomasz Gałuszka OP and Adam Poznański.

The book under review consists of two main parts. The first is a collection of studies, including a concise description of the whole phenomenon as well as several analytical studies focusing on the contents of interrogations of the Beguines of Świdnica/Schweidnitz. Part two is a new edition of the *Examination of the witnesses in the case of the Hooded Sisters of Świdnica* and its translation from Latin into Polish. The first five chapters of the first part have been written by Paweł Kras and the sixth by Tomasz Gałuszka. The manuscripts in the second part have been described by Gałuszka and Kras, while an analysis of both surviving manuscripts and their filiation has been provided by Gałuszka. This scholar has also prepared a Latin edition of the source. Its text has been translated by Adam Poznański, with a commentary to this part by Kras.

The previous edition, prepared and published in 1889 by Bolesław Ulanowski, was based on a fifteenth-century copy of the text kept in the Archives of the Cathedral Chapter of Cracow. The copy was later deemed to have been lost and was not rediscovered until 2016. In the 1950s a fair copy of a record of the interrogation of the Świdnica Beguines was found in the Vatican Library. The main reason behind this new editorial project was the conviction that the notarial instrument with the original record of the interrogation, preserved in the Vatican Library, should be used. The discovery of the fifteenth-century Cracow copy in the course of analysing the Beguines interrogation records must have been an important moment in the project, which was funded by the National Science Centre.

The chapter with the slightly misleading title ‘Wstęp’ (Introduction) contains a detailed and erudite discussion of research on the source in question, which has attracted the interest of scholars from many countries. In Chapter 1, ‘*Mulieres religiosæ* — beginki i nowy model kobiecej pobożności’ (*Mulieres religiosæ* — the Beguines and a new model of female piety), Kras seeks to provide a fairly concise description of the Beguine movement which would match the nature of the book under review. Such an approach has prevented him from including many aspects of the very extensive research into the Beguine movement in the Middle Ages, but this outline is undoubtedly a well-structured overview of the main problems tackled in studies of this strand of female religiosity. The author presents the key stages in the development of the Beguine movement: its emergence in Brabant and Flanders, its spread into Rhineland and Thuringia in the 1220s and 1230s and subsequently through France from the mid-thirteenth century. He then focuses on the religious motivations behind the emergence of the new movement, pointing, first of all, to the desire to cultivate voluntary poverty and discussing the dominant principles governing the organization of life in beguinages. He devotes relatively little space, on the other hand, to social theories trying to explain the dynamism of this grassroots movement. We could refer to Karl Bücher’s old theory linking the popularity of the movement to a demographic surplus of women in

towns,¹ a theory often explored by other scholars, also as part of ‘feminist’ studies,² and often as a matter of fact criticized,³ or to research pointing in this context to a growing differentiation of urban society in the Middle Ages.⁴ Just as interesting is the discussion of the very term ‘female religiosity’ and its juxtaposition with male religious movements and emphasis on the futility of such analyses. Discussing the theories of the origins of the name ‘Beguines’, the author mentions only some of them, those most often cited and have the greatest number of advocates. This issue is debated particularly frequently and is complex, as not only did the very term ‘Beguines’ appear in numerous variants (for example, *begginen*, *beoginen*, *begianen*, *beniaginen*, *begghen* or even *begutten*), but also the houses operating within this strand of female religious life were described differently in different regions of Europe and even within a single city. Sometime the name pointed to a specific character, relating, for example, to social status (for example *Wittwenhaus*, house of widows) or dominant occupation (like sewing/weaving: *Kloppelnonnen*). The women of Świdnica were described in the trial records a *moniales Capuciatæ* or *filia Udyllindis*. Sometimes a house would be described by different names in different periods, despite the fact that its nature did not change. On other occasions two words were used to describe a house in a single text (for example, *conventd oder beginenhausz*), which suggests that there were problems with terminology even when the communities were still in existence. Nevertheless, all the houses were part of the religious movement of lay women. The chapter ends with remarks concerning the Beghards, who sparked controversy in society much more frequently. Church dignitaries were convinced that their views reflected the Free Spirit heresy.

The next chapter is devoted to the 1311–12 Council of Vienne and the sanctions its constitutions introduced against the Beguines and the Beghards as well as Free Spirit sects. The author also points to the problem of the reception of these regulations. The work of the papal inquisitor John of Schwenkenfeld in Świdnica was a direct consequence of these decisions. As the author indicates, in Polish dioceses the traces of the reception of decisions taken at the

¹ Karl Bücher, *Die Frauenfrage im Mittelalter*, Tübingen, 1910.

² Uta C. Schmidt, “... que begine appellantur”, oder: Die Beginen als Frauenfrage in der Geschichtsschreibung’, in *Lustgarten und Dämonenpein*, ed. Anette Kuhn and Bea Lundt, Dortmund, 1997, pp. 54–77; Claudia Opitz, ‘Die “religiöse Frauenbewegung” des Mittelalters und ihre Auswirkungen in der Region des heutigen Ruhrgebiets’, in *Vergessene Frauen an der Ruhr*, ed. Bea Lundt, Cologne, 1992, pp. 175–93; Rebekka Habermas, ‘Die Beginen — eine “andere” Konzeption von Weiblichkeit?’, in *Die ungeschriebene Geschichte: Historische Frauenforschung: Dokumentation des 5. Historikerinnentreffens in Wien*, ed. Beatrix Bechtel et al., Vienna, 1984, pp. 199–207.

³ Edith Ennen warned against following modern thinking patterns in this case, *Frauen im Mittelalter*, Munich, 1994, p. 11.

⁴ For example, in old Marxist-oriented studies; cf. Ernst Werner and Martin Erb-stösser, ‘Die Beginen- und Begardenbewegung — Eine Erscheinung mit verschiedenen sozialen Inhalten’, in *Ideologische Probleme des mittelalterlichen Plebejertums: Die freigeistige Häresie und ihre sozialen Wurzeln*, ed. iidem, Berlin, 1960, pp. 23–46, 106–30.

Council of Vienne are quite modest. In Silesia they were implemented by Bishop Henry of Wierzbna, which was reflected also in the trials held there. After Henry's death the process was discontinued, only to be revived in Bishop Nancker's time. The 1332 trial of the Beguines of Świdnica was most likely the first presided over by John of Schwenkenfeld.

Chapter 3 is an analysis of the trial. Kras discusses the composition of the inquisition tribunal, the conduct of the trial and the order of interrogations; he mentions the people who were interrogated, the structure of the recorded testimonies, and finally examines the contents of the various statements in detail. The source provides a rare insight into the relations within the convent under trial, its internal structure and the rules governing the womens' lives. At the same time his analysis of the source enables the author to reconstruct the inquisitor's methods of working and the way he conducted the interrogations. Kras provides a balanced assessment of the reliability of the testimonies, pointing to those charges that may have been the results of the inquisitor's efforts as well as the aversion of younger or former sisters towards older members of the order.

In Chapter 4 the author focuses on the origins of the Świdnica Beguines as well as an analysis of phrases used in reference to their community. It turns out that the term *moniales Capuciatæ* was not used to refer to other Beguine communities in Europe. The name came from the sisters' distinctive hood. An exception can be found in the term *Kapuzen* sometimes used in Saxony. The word *moniales* however was frequently used with reference to the Beguines, although numerous objections were raised to this respect. It is possible that in Świdnica, where they were the only community of women, they may have been perceived as nuns. This would not be unusual. The Beguines of Świdnica themselves described their community as that of 'sisters'. On the other hand, John of Schwenkenfeld used the term 'Beguines' among others. The most intriguing term, however, is *filix Udyllindis*. Kras considers several possible explanations of this appellation. Two suggestions have been formulated in earlier studies. One equates Udilinda with St Odile, who lived in the late seventh/early eighth century, and whose cult was apparently popularized by Jacobus da Varagine. Another possible explanation is that the name referred to Odile of Liège, who lived in the late twelfth/early thirteenth century and was part of a religious movement associated with new forms of female devotion. She was regarded as one of the first Beguines. Both theories provoke considerable doubts. In the case of the first, Kras notes that the oldest among the Świdnica sisters, blind Anna, knew nothing about this saint as a patron of the Beguines. Yet this is without doubt an argument *ex silentio*. The scholar proposes another explanation. He has concluded that when describing themselves as 'daughters of Udilinda', the Beguines may have been referring to Odelinda of Pyrzyce, who was the mistress of the Cologne beguinage. It was founded around 1291 — but there is no direct evidence that would substantiate such an assertion. The author tries to justify it by pointing to the similar organizational structure of the Świdnica and Cologne

convents. What may arouse some doubts is the chronology. The blind Anna referred to earlier, when asked whether the Świdnica community had been approved by the Church, said that she knew nothing about this, and if this indeed had happened, then, according to Anna, the sister sent to obtain such approval must have done so a long time ago. The Świdnica community was certainly founded before 1304. Anna joined it in 1306, when its mistress was Geza. We cannot be entirely certain, whether this was the first mistress of the convent. She is regarded as such by the editors of this particular source. If we take into account blind Anna's statement, we can assume that the convent had existed long before she entered it. It is therefore possible that it existed already in the 1290s. If the Cologne origins of the houses of the 'daughters of Udilinda' be accepted, the expansion of the model created by the Cologne Beguines would be remarkable, as they appear to have quickly spread (after 1291) as far as Silesia. This may arouse certain doubts. Any meeting between Geza and Odelinda must remain only a matter of conjecture, given the current state of research. On the other hand, however, we know from the trial records that the Beguines did stay in other, distant houses; for example, Adelaide is known to have spent some time in Aachen. The activity of this community of Beguine houses has already been analysed by Johannes Asen. The existence of such a community is beyond any doubt. Kras also points to the use of the terms *Einung* and *Einung zum Einhorn* within the community. We do know quite why one fragment features the phrase *Einung zum Einhorn*, with the two terms being treated as separate a bit later. Nevertheless, the Latin term *unio* used by the Świdnica sisters may be translated into German as *Einung*. Perhaps an analysis of Latin terminology used within the community's other houses would yield new arguments. Despite many doubts, at this point the theory formulated by Kras seems to be the best documented and the most likely. The chapter ends, rather unexpectedly for the reader, with a description of physical work done by the sisters. The fragment might be better suited to the following chapter, entitled 'In search of spiritual perfection', in which the work of the Beguines is analysed as an element of self-improvement.

Chapter 5 is devoted to the practices in which the Beguines apparently engaged towards seeking spiritual perfection. The main question discussed in this part is the relation of the Beguines' teachings to the Free Spirit doctrine. Kras concludes that in the Świdnica case there was no reception of the doctrine; what emerged instead was a distinct ascetic path that was to lead to a union with God. The main elements of these religious tendencies included extreme asceticism, mortification, negation of earthly life — hence the similarities to the Free Spirit doctrine. However, this does not mean that they were interlinked.

The last chapter contains a description of actions undertaken with regard to the Beguines by the Dominican inquisitor John of Schwenkenfeld. Gałuszka points to analogies between views expressed in the Beguines' testimonies and some views of the Franciscans. For example, he raises the question of deliberations about the possible incarnation of God if man had not sinned. Another

question, present since the beginning of Christianity and often intensely debated by the Dominicans, concerned the nature of Christ. John of Schwenkenfeld was in this case a classic Thomist, adhering to the concept of *unum esse in Christo*. One of the Beguines, Adelaide, spoke of Christ's divine and human natures. Gałuszka notes analogies to the assertions of some younger Dominicans or, in a slightly different respect, to the ideas of the Franciscan John Duns Scotus, who, unlike the Dominicans, strongly emphasized the human incarnation of Christ. The assertions of the Beguines in their testimonies were deemed heretical by John of Schwenkenfeld. Another controversy concerned the question of whether Christ took his cross to heaven with him, as was claimed in her testimony by Adelaide, who had apparently heard it from Margaretha de Lychenow. Gałuszka points to the differences between the Dominicans and the Franciscans in this matter in the context of Christ's resurrection and the cross that was to appear at the Last Judgement. In this case, too, the Beguines were closer in their views to the Franciscans. According to Gałuszka, the Beguines may have been deliberately challenging the cult of the Holy Cross, to which the Dominican Church in Świdnica was dedicated. This part of the book seems extraordinarily ingenious despite the fact that some hypotheses are debatable.

It ends with a brief summary pointing to three perspectives on the life of the community, perspectives revealed by the trial records. They express the views of younger sisters, who were critical of practices imposed by older sisters, views of older sisters who were convinced that their path to perfection was correct and finally, the perspective of the inquisitor, John of Schwenkenfeld.

The editorial part of the book begins with a description of the surviving manuscripts as well as an analysis of the texts which seek to establish the filiation of the manuscripts and the links between them. It has been demonstrated that the original text came from notes which were compiled by the inquisitor and inquisitorial notary, and on the basis of which a draft was prepared. The draft became the basis for the fair copy currently kept in the Vatican Library. Gałuszka's findings suggest that there was another fair copy which has not survived and which later became the basis for a copy of the manuscript kept in the Archives of the Cathedral Chapter of Cracow. An analysis of omissions suggests that the content of the lost second fair copy may have been in some parts more critical with regard to the Świdnica Beguines. The basis for the current edition is the Vatican copy. The introduction to the edition does not mention any editorial instructions, but the rules followed in it are described in some detail. The editors have sought to preserve medieval spelling, which seems entirely appropriate. However, the practical implementation of this rule raises some questions. The miniscule 'u' is written in accordance with the sound and content of the manuscript, but in some words 'u' is changed into 'v', if the letter 'v' is found in the medieval original (for example, in the word *vir*). Such corrections

of the text seem debatable. Most editorial instructions recommend that the letters 'w', 'v' and 'u' be changed in accordance with their phonetic value. Control of the editing and spelling of the various words is facilitated by a facsimile of the Vatican and Cracow manuscripts published at the end of the book, which should be regarded as a major asset. Adam Poznański's Polish translation of the entire source is remarkably careful, maintaining a balance between faithfulness to the original and stylistic correctness. Perhaps for stylistic reasons it would have been better to avoid some excessively long sentences or repetitions of the conjunction 'że' (that) in one sentence (for example in IV, 6; V, 2).

We have now at our disposal a comprehensive study of a very interesting source as well as its modern edition with a translation, which should provide another incentive to carry out research into religiosity in the Middle Ages.

Piotr Oliński
(Toruń)

(Translated by Anna Kijak)
(Proofreading by Yelizaveta Crofts)

Michał Tymowski, *Europejczycy i Afrykanie: Wzajemne odkrycia i pierwsze kontakty* [The Europeans and Africans: Mutual Findings and First Contacts], Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 2017, 428 pp.

The new book by Michał Tymowski, an outstanding historian and Africa specialist, describes a fascinating moment in history: the civilizational and cultural clash of Europeans with the Africans on the African Atlantic coast in the fifteenth century. Michał Tymowski, the author of many works on the history of West Sudan including *Historia Mali* (History of Mali, 1979) and *Państwa Afryki przedkolonialnej* (States of Pre-Colonial Africa, 1999), editor and co-author of the monumental *Historia Afryki do początku XIX wieku* (History of Africa to the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century, 1996), has been publishing scientific articles on the theme of first contacts between the Portuguese and Africans for more than ten years. The reviewed book is therefore the culmination of the author's reflections on this problem.

The introduction contains a review of Portuguese authors and historians from other European countries who study this subject. Depending on the type of contact, anthropologists have introduced several basic descriptive terms for different types of cultural interaction: 'clash of cultures', 'cultural contact' and 'acculturation' — these are dealt with by the author in specific chapters of the book. Tymowski refers to the ideas expressed by Jan Kieniewicz in the book *Od ekspansji do dominacji: Próba teorii kolonializmu* (From Expansion to Domination: An Attempt of Colonialism Theory, 1986), but introduces his own detailed contributions, and limits the studied period to the first seventy years of contact between Europeans and Africans starting from 1434, when Portuguese sailed

around the Saharan Cape Nao in the region of Cape Bojador, until the first decade of the sixteenth century. These were, as we read in stories preserved from that epoch, fresh contacts not yet constrained by routine. Once Africa had been circumnavigated and India reached in this way by sea, the importance of contacts on the West-Atlantic coast decreased for the Portuguese, and in the sixteenth century became a well-known stage of a longer journey.

The basic materials documenting the first contacts are chronicles and stories told by the participants of these expeditions. The oldest chronicle was written by Gomes Eanes de Zurara (*Cronica dos feitos do Guiné*), an admirer of Prince Henry the Navigator the initiator of exploratory voyages. Zurara did not take part in the travels, but he gathered information from their actual participants. He praised the chivalric nature of the endeavours, which he demonstrated in his descriptions of armed clashes with Azenegs, Berber fishermen and nomads from West Sahara situated north of the Senegal River estuary to the Atlantic Ocean. The earliest direct accounts of peaceful meetings with Africans were made by merchants. The report of a Venetian inhabitant in the Portuguese service, Alvise da Ca da Mosto, regarding his two expeditions to Senegal and Gambia Rivers in the years 1455 and 1456 is of a great value. He initiated trade contacts with the Wolof and Serer people. This was a similar action to that of a Flanders merchant from Bruges, Eustache Delafosse, in the years 1479–80, who reached Guinea Bay and broke the Portuguese trade monopoly. The fullest summary of Portuguese expeditions to West Africa in the fifteenth century can be found in accounts from the beginning of the next century written by Valentim Fernandes and Duarte Pacheco Pereira. A great value of Tymowski's book is that he frequently quotes fragments of Zurara's chronicle and other texts from the fifteenth century, both in translation and in the original language, that is, Portuguese, Italian or Latin. This allows the reader the pleasure of reading the original language form of the message.

The book consists of four chapters with the following titles: 'Początki', 'Spotkania', 'Mniejszości wśród większości', 'Jedni o drugich', 'Powstanie obrazu innego' (Beginnings, Meetings, Minorities among Majorities, One on Another, Creation of the Image of Another). Each chapter is divided into sub-chapters focused on analysis of facts and phenomena referred to in the chapter's title. Chapter 1, 'Początki' (pp. 27–114) discusses the first contacts between Europeans and people from the so-called Dark Continent. The author analyses the phenomena of fear and courage connected with facing the unknown. After all, until Bajador Cape was sailed around in 1434, the common collective fear and belief had been that south of this geographic point prevailing conditions made life impossible. Once this specific barrier of fear was broken, the fear resurfaced, this time mixed with courage in the context of fights with Azenegs in the region of the Arguim and Tider islands. The Portuguese hunted there for slaves, although they were not always victorious and also lost their fighters in the fight. South of the estuary of the Senegal River the Europeans faced a different situation with the numerous local peoples. The area between Senegal

and the Green Cape was inhabited by Wolofs, who had several state organizations. South of there lived Serers, with their societies organized under a structure of chieftains and hostile toward the Portuguese, and on the banks of the Gambia River lived the Mande people, who were politically subservient to the state of Mali. Here the Europeans did not have the armed advantage over Africans; crossbows and bombards shot from caravels were confronted with the Africans' most dangerous weapon — bows with poisoned arrows. Getting into the river current, caravels had to cope with numerous canoes full of fighters. The fact that the Africans kidnapped by the Europeans never returned made those left behind believe that they had been eaten by the white people, which made them fight all the harder.

In Chapter 1's sub-title 'Śmierć i postawy wobec śmierci' (Death and Attitudes to Death) the author presents the causes and means of death which came about as the result of armed fights, due to sicknesses, food, or the Guinea Bay climate which was deadly for the white people. Chivalrous death in the fight against pagans, for God's glory, was noteworthy and commemorated with respect for the wealthy leaders (other soldiers died anonymously). Among Africans death claimed victims in the crowded cargo bays of slave-filled caravels waiting to be transported to Portugal. Free Africans were, according to the observations of Ca da Mosto, characterized by a 'contempt of death' in clashes with the Europeans; Africans brought to Portugal often died due to the changed climate and food, or as a result of trauma after being removed from the African environment.

In the next sub-chapter of Chapter 1 'Jak się porozumiewali?' (How Did They Communicate?), the author talks of organizing interpreters and translators in Portugal to facilitate contacts with African people. It turned out that the knowledge of Arab languages resulting from the presence of Portuguese garrisons in Morocco was useless in conversation with the Berbers, the Azenegs of the Sahara desert, and particularly south of the Senegal River, where dozens of different tribe languages were used. So black slaves, after christening, when they acquired sufficient knowledge of Portuguese language, were taught to become translators. The fates of these translators varied. After landing in Africa they were often either killed by the locals or escaped back to their people, but a certain number of them, accustomed to slavery and accepting life in Europe, fulfilled the tasks expected of them. Tymowski provides information on the creation of the first dictionary containing words from the *Akan* and *Mande* languages used at that time on the Gold Coast at the end of the fifteenth or the beginning of the sixteenth century, and he quotes some of them with the supposed translation. The last part of Chapter 1 is titled 'Zdumienie, zdziwienie, ciekawość i osobliwości' (Amazement, surprise, curiosity and peculiarities). 'In Zurara's chronicle' — writes Tymowski — 'curiosity and desire to get to know the unknown lands and people was placed among the five main reasons behind expeditions to Africa' (p. 93). Zurara emphasizes the Africans' astonishment when they encountered the caravels and alien newcomers. This astonishment was accompanied by fear, but also curiosity: at the beginning

of the sixteenth century there were even occurrences of courage and risk when some Africans would step onto caravel decks as free people. Alvise da Ca da Mosto reported a conversation with Budomel, the ruler of Kayor, who asked him about European religion. His questions related to God, the way of explaining the world, and man's place in it (p. 103). This ruler was curious for political reasons. But the Europeans were also interested in African gods, since they planned to baptize the pagans. They brought wooden figures of the local gods to Europe. Besides these fetishes, the Portuguese were surprised to see ivory sculptures of animals and people, including the white newcomers, made by Sapi people from the Sierra Leone area, and sculptures cast in bronze from Benin. Tymowski describes these artefacts in detail in the last chapter of the book.

Chapter 2, titled 'Spotkania' (Meetings), also consists of four parts. It contains discussion on the already well-developed forms of contact between Europeans and Africans. The first sub-chapter: 'Ucztonowanie' (Feasting) shows the arrivals' efforts to build friendly relations with Africans; the most obvious and accepted way to achieve this, as throughout human history, was the invitation to feast, during which the parties became mutually acquainted. This was also an occasion to enter into trade transactions. The next sub-chapter 'Organizacja i przebieg pierwszych spotkań' (Organization and the Course of First Meetings) contains descriptions and Tymowski's critical analysis of three such meetings and feasts: between Valarte, a Danish knight in the Portuguese service, and Guitenia, the local Serer leader, between Alvise da Ca da Mosto and Budomel, the ruler of Kayor, and between Diego de Azambuja and Casamansa, the leader of the settlement on the Gold Coast in 1482. This last meeting was the most fruitful, since the Europeans obtained consent for construction of fortress Sao Jorge da Mina. Negotiations were conducted through the intermediary of interpreters educated in Portugal. The next sub-chapter: 'Miejsca handlu' (Trade Places) is a description of evolution of organizational forms of trade from the mid-fifteenth century conducted by the Portuguese with Africans. These forms included concluding such transactions on caravels, at the coast, or at the market in a guarded trading post, for example in Arguim at the White Cape or in Sao Jorge da Mina at the Gold Coast. The author's detailed analysis based on reports perfectly reconstructs these economic phenomena.

The last section of Chapter 2 deals with the 'Podróż wolnych Afrykanów i poselstwa władców afrykańskich do Portugalii' (Travel of Free Africans and African Rulers' Legations to Portugal). This refers to the exchange of deputations in 1456 between Portugal and Benin in the Bay of Guinea. In response to the Portuguese deputation which arrived with King John II's gifts for the ruler of Benin, the latter sent his representative — the chief of the Gwato — who was formally accepted at the Portuguese court. Both parties treated each other according to the principle of equality. Portugal was interested in trade and the Christianization of Benin, whilst Benin's king hoped to purchase firearms. Another instance of movement between the regions was the journey to Portugal in 1488 of the impeached ruler of the Wolofs, Bumie Jeleen. In exchange for

being christened and adopting the name Joao, the king of Portugal sent him back with a flotilla of twenty caravels and a plan to establish another fortress at the estuary of the Senegal River. The plan failed as Bumie Jeleen was murdered by the leader of the expedition. Relations with the Wolofs were not broken, but Christianization was no longer discussed because Islam was exerting a strong influence on the region from the north. King John II continued gathering information on Africa and its interior using the methods first undertaken by Henry the Navigator. Although in the mid-fifteenth century opinions regarding the 'barbarity' of Africans were common, by the end of the century the trade and diplomatic relations created a precedent for treating Africans on an equal basis. Tymowski suggests (p. 202), that in the 1530s and the following decades, the European sense of superiority over the African way of life became stronger. This was connected with stereotyping, the mass trade of black slaves, and the failure to Christianize the states and rulers of West Africa.

The Chapter 3, titled 'Mniejszości wśród większości' (Minorities among Majorities), contains descriptions of the lives of African slaves in Portugal and an analysis of the cultural and psychological aspects of their presence there. In 1441 the first group of African slaves was brought to Portugal. On this topic the author restricts himself to the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century. It was impossible to count the black slaves in Portugal (which had approximately a population of one million). Those caught or purchased on the coast of Gulf of Guinea were also transported to the desert island of St Thomas, discovered in 1471 and used for sugar cane cultivation. It was a laboratory for the plantation economy transferred in the 1530s to Brazil. In the first part of this chapter the author quotes (pp. 210–11) an excellent fragment of Zurara's chronicle describing tragic moments of the division of slaves' families brought to the town of Lagos. Tymowski emphasizes that the object of his research is not the economic side of slavery, but the forms of cultural contact between the African slaves and the Portuguese. Giving names to slaves after christening or dressing slaves in a European manner were the forms of acculturation which incorporated these people into the local community, both women and men (the typical work of slaves being as domestic help). Sexual contacts created a new group of mulattos. As the existence of an African minority in Portugal became a fact, similarly — though for different reasons — a Portuguese minority was formed in Africa. This minority does not refer to the fortress crews, but rather several specific categories of white settlers. The author mentions the problem of exiles (*degradados*) and fugitives (*lançados*) settling in Africa at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century. Exile to Portuguese fortresses in Africa, to the Green Cape Islands or to St Thomas Island where climate was deadly for Europeans belonged to a category of the most severe punishments issued in Portugal, being sometimes a substitute for capital punishment. Sometimes the exiles managed to escape to communities of the African population, where they often integrated. Those who had mixed families there were called *tangomaos*. The author devotes the final fragment of the third chapter to the role of women in the Portuguese

expeditions to Africa. There were few Portuguese women in the predominantly male world of explorers, on the whole only those who were punished by exile to fortresses, or who worked there in the hospital or the kitchen.

The final, Chapter 4 titled 'Jedni o drugich: Powstanie obrazu innego' (One on Another: Creation of the Image of Another) (pp. 282–334) is a recapitulation of the European conduct toward Africans as presented by the sources cited in the previous parts of the book. The clash in the fifteenth century of the arrivals to the coast of West Africa, first the armed and then peaceful, with the local African peoples, getting to know their demeanour, way of life, customs, and social organization resulted in rejection of earlier misleading concepts about the 'barbarism' of Guinea inhabitants. Until the beginning of the sixteenth century, a feeling of superiority toward Africans did not arise on the Portuguese side; this was 'revived' by the mass trade in slaves. But we do not know how the Africans perceived the Europeans; we only have indirect reports based on Portuguese accounts. An external view of the Portuguese can be found in African art of the fifteenth and the sixteenth century in the form of ivory sculptures from Sierra Leone and bronze casts from Benin, which artistically present the image of a white man.

Michał Tymowski's book, a work showing erudition and wonderful documentation, is also an in-depth psychological study of the attitudes of people from two worlds obscure to each other at the time of their confrontation. The book is written in a communicative way so it is easy to read, especially since Tymowski has refrained from using footnotes and instead placed references to the authors whose works he has used in brackets inside the relevant sentences. He gives the surname and the year of publication of a given work, which enables the reader to find the work in the bibliography at the end of the volume. The volume itself is very extensive and I believe that Tymowski has used everything that has so far been published on European — African relations in the fifteenth and the sixteenth century. The book contains illustrations, two maps of West Africa, and a summary in English.

Andrzej Dziubiński
(Warsaw)

(Translated by Elżbieta Petrajtis-O'Neill)
(Proofreading by Yelizaveta Crofts)

Natalia Nowakowska, *King Sigismund of Poland and Martin Luther: The Reformation before Confessionalization*, London: Oxford University Press, 2018, 279 pp.

The book under review, authored by Natalia Nowakowska, is the next of her writings devoted to the Polish Jagiellonian dynasty. It was preceded by a work based on the doctoral dissertation entitled *Church, State and Dynasty in Renaissance Poland: The Career of Cardinal Fryderyk Jagiellon (1468–1503)* (Ashgate, 2007); this was published in Polish as *Królewski kardynał: Studium kariery Fryderyka Ja-*

giellończyka (1468–1503), Cracow, 2011). It received favourable reviews in British, American, Italian, French and Polish historical journals. Apart from appraisals of this book authored by Zofia Wilk-Wośk and printed in *Piotrkowskie Zeszyty Naukowe* (vol. 13, 2012, pp. 265–71), and by Janusz Małek, published in *Gdański Rocznik Ewangelicki* (vol. 2, 2008, pp. 155–56), of considerable interest is the in-depth review written by Father Szymon Tracz for *Folia Historica Cracoviensia* (vol. 18, 2012, pp. 287–307), which also contains a number of critical notes and observations. Nowakowska's book won the Kulczycki Prize in the USA.

Let us commence by introducing the author of the reviewed work. Natalia Nowakowska works at the Faculty of History, Somerville College University of Oxford. She is the Principal Investigator of a five-year (2013–18) research grant financed by the European Research Council (€ 1.4 million), entitled *The Jagiellonians: Dynasty, Memory and Identity in Central Europe* (cf. www.jagiellonians.com). Six historians participate in the project. They write about the countries in which the Jagiellonians ruled, that is Poland, Lithuania, Bohemia and Hungary, as well as in of the Holy Roman Empire, where women from the Jagiellonian dynasty were electresses and duchesses, and also about Sweden, of which Catherine Jagiellon, initially Duchess of Finland, became queen. And thus Giedrė Mickūnaitė from Vilnius focuses on the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Slovakian Stanislava Kuzmová on Hungary, while Dušan Zupka writes about the women of the Jagiellonian dynasty who became the wives of various electors and dukes (previously mentioned) in the Holy Roman Empire, Susanna Niiranen from Finland — about Catherine Jagiellon, Queen of Sweden, and the Russian Ilya Afanasyev about Bohemia. Nowakowska, the Principal Investigator of the project, focuses on Poland.

While discussing the contents of the book under review, we should make an attempt at answering the following questions: 1. What is the place of the history of Poland — and perforce that of the reviewed work — in British historiography? 2. Is the structure of the book and the method of presentation used optimal? 3. Has the author's fundamental thesis, namely that Sigismund I the Old employed a 'soft' form of combating Lutheranism in Poland in spite of his 'hard' declarations (anti-Lutheran edicts), been proven in the text? 4. Does the factual material gathered in the book require supplementation? 5. Was not Sigismund I the Old's 'soft' policy towards Lutheranism due to the fact that the development of the Reformation in the Crown proceeded with a delay of nearly twenty years?

When giving an interview to the Catholic *Tygodnik Powszechny* weekly ('Jagiellonowie to była marka', 7 August 2017), Natalia Nowakowska explained the reasons for her interest in the history of Central Europe, including that of Poland, thus: 'I was born in London in a family that had emigrated to the British Isles. As a child I went to Polish school every Saturday. My parents sent me to an English school, however they wanted me to remain in touch with Polish language and culture. Our history classes were based on textbooks published by the expatriate community. Already then it struck me that the history of

Europe presented in British and Polish books was completely different. English children learnt about Great Britain, France, Italy and Germany, while further east there was a void. It was the same at university — we were taught that the history of Europe was the history of Western Europe. It was probably at that time that I started thinking about how to connect these two different visions'.¹ This opinion may be extended to practically the whole of British and American historiography. If we were to limit ourselves to the history of Poland, then we would find only a few English-language books on the subject, both syntheses and monographs.

The structure of the work and the research methods employed by Natalia Nowakowska are somewhat surprising, but nevertheless most interesting. The book has been divided into four parts: 1. 'Hypothesis', 2. 'Contexts', 3. 'Episodes', 4. 'Language analysis'. It also has two attachments. The first contains a list of fifty-nine trials conducted in Poland in the years 1517–35 against persons suspected of Lutheranism. The second is a list of texts (letters printed in the *Acta Tomicianana* collection, manuscripts and prints) which were used by contemporary Polish religious polemicists to define Lutheranism and Catholicism. Of note is the very thorough personal, topographical and subject index.

In her work, the author has adopted an issue-based arrangement, which in light of the quantity, quality and nature of sources was — in my opinion — the correct approach. For British historians, as the author aptly writes, the early Reformation in Poland is a *terra incognita*. I am afraid that the same problem, albeit naturally to a lesser degree, applies to Polish historiography. To a considerable extent this is due to the paucity of sources for the period of rule of Sigismund I the Old in Poland (1506–48). The situation changed utterly during the reign of Sigismund II Augustus (1548–72), and this explains the large number of works devoted to the rise of the Reformation in Poland. When recreating the beginnings of the Reformation in Poland, the above-mentioned small number and brevity of sources makes it necessary to apply methods used by mediaevalists. Nowakowska was well aware of this fact and found an optimal solution.

She commenced the first part of her book with a presentation of the trial of a townsman, one Maciej Gutfort, who had been accused of non-observance of fasts and participation in Lutheran conventicles. Proceedings were conducted before the bishop's court in Cracow in December 1532 and ended with just an admonishment. A total of fifty-nine trials held in the Crown in the years 1522–35

¹ 'Urodziłam się w Londynie, ale moja rodzina przyjechała na Wyspy. Jako dziecko co sobotę chodziłam do polskiej szkoły. Rodzice chcieli, abym poza szkołą angielską miała też kontakt z językiem i kulturą polską. Na historii nauczyliśmy się z podręczników wydanych przez emigrację. Już wtedy uderzyło mnie, że historia Europy w książkach brytyjskich i polskich jest zupełnie inna. Angielskie dzieci uczyły się o Wielkiej Brytanii, Francji, Włoszech, Niemczech, dalej na Wschód była pustka. Na studiach było podobnie, uczono nas, że historia Europy to historia Zachodu. Chyba już wtedy zaczęłam myśleć, jak połączyć te dwie różne wizje'.

concluded with the accused being admonished or fined; only in Danzig (Gdańsk) were thirteen people executed, however these sentences were passed against the leaders of a social revolt, while the preachers were punished with banishment. In the Holy Roman Empire there were 380 such executions in the 1520s (p. 17). The conclusion seems obvious. Sigismund I the Old preferred to use persuasion instead of oppression, although his severe Lutheran edicts might appear to belie this. The King's statement in his letter to Johann Eck may be viewed as characteristic: 'allow me to remain the king of sheep' (cf. Kazimierz Hartleb, *Ostatni Jagiellonowie*, Lwów, 1938, p. 31), while in the letter to the Archbishop of Lwów, who strove to limit the religious freedoms of 'schismatics' (the Orthodox), he wrote that he desired to ensure that each of his subjects enjoyed freedom of confession and religious practice (ibidem, p. 32). In the chapters entitled 'Drama in Danzig: The Crown and Reformation in Royal Prussia' (pp. 77–96) and 'A Difficult Nephew: The Polish Crown and Lutheran Ducal Prussia' (pp. 97–120) the author conducts an analysis of the policies which this ruler implemented in the northern provinces of the Polish state — in Royal Prussia and Ducal Prussia (a fiefdom since 1525) respectively — and lends support to the thesis that Sigismund I the Old applied his officially restrictive policy towards Lutheranism with a degree of moderation. Following the bloody crackdown carried out in Danzig in 1526, society in Royal Prussia was in a state of shock, and this fact halted the development of Lutheranism in the province for many years. This is attested to by, among others, the minutes of the Royal Prussian general regional council for the years 1526–42 (omitted by the author), which contain practically no mention of the Reformation or Lutheranism (cf. *Protokoły sejmiku generalnego Prus Królewskich*, 4 vols, ed. Marian Biskup et al., Toruń, 2001–17). Lutheranism continued to develop in secret, however, and already in 1542 the royal burgrave in Danzig, Jan Werden, requested Sigismund I the Old to release him from office, for he was unable to stem the changes taking place in the liturgy of churches in the city (Berta Bockelmann, *Danzigs Politik in der Reformationszeit im Briefwechsel zwischen Johann von Werden und Herzog Albrecht*, Kiel, 1968, pp. 194, 196). The situation in Ducal Prussia was altogether different, for on 6 July 1525 Duke Albrecht of Prussia officially introduced Lutheranism in the province — in direct contravention of Article 7 of the Treaty of Cracow of 1525, which made it obligatory to punish clergymen infringing the order and acts of the 'Holy Christian Church' (the Catholic Church). As we can therefore see, the principle of *cuius regio, eius religio* was adopted there quite early. Sigismund I the Old admonished his nephew to return to the fold of the 'old Church', however he had to accept the fact of his apostasy. When discussing the policy followed by Sigismund I the Old towards Lutheranism in the Prussian fiefdom it would have been worthwhile to make use of two letters from 1525 that were published in tome 7 of *Acta Tomiciana* (p. 233, letters nos. 33 and 35), well-known to the author. The first was written by the Bishop of Przemyśl, Andrzej Krzycki, to the papal legate to Hungary, Antoni Puglioni, while the second was sent by Sigismund I the Old to Pope Clement VII; both are available in Polish translations (cf. *Władztwo Polski*

w *Prusiech Zakonnych i Książęcych (1454-1657): Wybór źródeł*, ed. Adam Vetulani, Wrocław, 1953, pp. 90–104). Krzycki explained the conclusion of the Treaty of Cracow by the desire for peace, and clarified the secularization of the State of the Teutonic Order thus (ibidem, pp. 94–95): ‘as regards religion, the Pope has already been informed that Lutheranism is inviolable among this Order, while the Church of Rome is cursed. Many so-called Commanders and clergymen marry, altars and paintings are destroyed, ceremonies and rites of the Church are abolished, and all sanctity desecrated’, however adding that ‘under the pious ruler [Duke Albrecht], conjoined with the nation that is pure, they shall come to their senses’,² that is they shall return to the Catholic Church. In turn, Sigismund I excused himself to the Pope as follows: ‘for I strive earnestly, without sparing effort or care, to extinguish and repulse from my Kingdom this heretical pestilence, this dangerous conflagration that has set fire to a close and large wall of my state’.³ In Ducal Prussia, a Lutheran confessionalization based on intolerance towards Catholics was the norm (they could not hold office throughout province or at court, while later it became compulsory for university students to swear an oath to maintain the pure — that is the Lutheran — faith). Similar restrictions, but targeting the Lutherans, were in force in Catholic Warmia, which was ruled by bishops.

Before we proceed to answering the question whether the book under review, in spite of its copious bibliography, requires supplementation as regards factual material, we should take a closer look at its title. Namely, for readers unacquainted with the era the name of the work could suggest that it concerns personal or correspondence contacts between King Sigismund I the Old and the reformer Martin Luther, while such relations never in fact existed. The title *The Stance of King Sigismund I of Poland towards Lutheranism* would have been more apt. The author gave her work the subtitle *The Reformation before Confessionalization*, and this would mean that she is inclined to adopt the paradigm of confessionalization for the Polish-Lithuanian state. Although I personally supported the usefulness of this model, Polish historians are divided on the issue (cf. Jacek Wijaczka, ‘Czy w państwie polsko-litewskim w czasach wczesnonowożytnych nastąpiła konfesjonalizacja?’, in *Dysydenci czy decydenci? Protestanci w obydwu częściach Prus i Koronie w XVI-XVIII wieku*, ed. Wojciech Zawadzki, Elbląg, 2018, pp. 13–29). I think that the inclusion of a few additional works — both publications of sources and studies — would have supplemented the factual material gathered in the book without impacting the conclusions set forward therein. As regards published sources, the author has lim-

² ‘co się tyczy religii, już poprzednio powiadomiono papieża, że luteranizm jest wśród tego Zakonu nietykalny, zaś Kościół rzymski przeklinany. Wielu tak zwanych komturów i duchownych żeni się, ołtarze i obrazy są niszczone, ceremonie i obrzędy kościelne znoszone, wszystkie świętości zbezczeszczone’, ‘pod nabożnym władcą, [ks. Albrechtem] złączeni z narodem niczym nie skalanym powrócą do rozsądku’.

³ ‘staram się bowiem usilnie, nie żałując wysiłku i troski, ugasić i odeprzeć od Królestwa mego tę zarazę heretycką, niebezpieczny pożar, od którego płonie bliska i wielka ściana mojego państwa’.

ited herself to volume 30 of *Elementa ad fontium editiones*, which contains the letters sent by Sigismund I the Old to Duke Albrecht; unfortunately, no reference is made to volume 51 of the series with Duke Albrecht's replies to these letters. Further, no mention is made of volume 45 of *Elementa*, which contains a letter written by Liborius Schadilka to Duke Albrecht regarding the translation into Polish of Luther's catechism, or of volume 46 of *Elementa* with the published letters of Justus Ludwik Decjusz and Mikołaj Nipszyc to Duke Albrecht, dated mainly to the years 1525–35 in Cracow. It would have also been beneficial to make use of Carl Peter P. Woelky's *Urkundenbuch des Bisthums Culm* (vol. 2, Danzig, 1887), which notes the first mentions of Lutheranism in this diocese, as well as of the newer edition of the Treaty of Cracow of 1525 (cf. *Die Staatsverträge des Herzogtums Preussen*, vol. 1: *Polen und Litauen: Verträge und Belehnungsurkunde 1525–1657/58*, ed. Stephan and Heidrun Dolezel, Berlin, 1971). Furthermore, the author has omitted *Volumina Constitutionum*, part 1, vol. 1 1493–1526 and vol. 2 1527–1549 (ed. Stanisław Grodziski, Irena Dwornicka and Waclaw Uruszczak, Warsaw, 1996). An oversight in the bibliography is the lack of two biographies: Zygmunt Wojciechowski's *Zygmunt Stary (1506–1548)* (1st edn, Warsaw, 1946, 2nd edn, Warsaw 1979) and Kazimierz Hartleb's *Jan Zambocki, dworzanin i sekretarz JKM* (Warsaw, 1937). As regards German authors, the following works have been omitted: Gottfried Lengnich, *Geschichte der preussischen Lande, Königlich-Polnischen Antheils* (vol. 1, [Danzig], 1722); Heinz Neumeyer, *Kirchengeschichte von Danzig und Westpreussen in evangelischer Sicht* (vol. 1, Leer, 1971); August Borrmann, *Ermland und die Reformation (1523–1772)* (Königsberg, 1912); Richard Fischer, *Achatius von Zehmen, Woywode von Marienburg* (Danzig, 1897); Arthur Rhod, *Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche im Posener Lande* (Würzburg, 1956) and Christoph Wollek, *Das Domkapitel von Plock 1524–1564* (Cologne, 1972).

Sigismund I the Old's 'soft' policy towards Lutheranism in the years 1517–35 was conditioned by the fact that in Poland the Reformation developed at least two decades later than in the Holy Roman Empire. The king's anti-Lutheran edicts, perforce severe, served to both halt the reading of Reformation books and prints, and discourage potential students from enrolling at the University of Wittenberg, where Luther lectured. Another obstacle was the language in which these publications were written — primarily German. If we compare the number of students from the Crown and Prussia (both Royal and Ducal) who studied at Wittenberg in the years 1521–35, we will be struck by the minimal proportion of those from the former. However, it increased rapidly after 1535. The number of Poles from the Crown who were matriculated at the University of Wittenberg developed as follows: in the years 1516–20 there were 6 students, 5 in the years 1521–25, 3 in the years 1526–30, 10 in the years 1531–35, 39 in the years 1536–40, 54 in the years 1541–45 and 23 in the years 1546–50 (cf. Marian Pawlak, *Studia uniwersyteckie młodzieży z Prus Królewskich w XVI–XVIII w.*, Toruń, 1988, tab. 9). Amongst them was the eminent Polish humanist and irenist Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski. He enrolled in the academic year 1531/32, and for a number of years lived at the house of Philip Melancthon, Martin Luther's closest collaborator. In contrast, considerably more students from Royal Prussia and Ducal Prussia were matriculated at

Wittenberg, the centre of Lutheran thought. In the years 1517–48 there were 40 from Danzig alone, as well as 16 from Elbing (Elbląg), 8 from Thorn (Toruń) and 29 from Königsberg. Later, following the death of Martin Luther in 1546, the number of students from both parts of Prussia enrolling at Wittenberg increased considerably. We are in possession of a list for the years 1518–60, when Philip Melanchthon was a professor at the University. And thus, during this period of 42 years a total of 139 students from the largest cities of Prussian Poland enrolled at Wittenberg: 62 from Danzig, 23 from Elbing and 11 from Thorn, and the following number from smaller cities and townships: Allenstein (Olsztyn) — 1, Braunsberg (Braniewo) — 3, Guttstadt (Dobre Miasto) — 2, Heilsberg (Lidzbark Warmiński) — 2, Hohendorf (Czernin) — 1, Konitz (Chojnice) — 5, Kulm (Chełmno) — 3, Marienburg (Malbork) — 11, Schwetz (Świecie) — 1, Stuhm (Sztum) — 2 and 2 from Wartenburg (Barczewo); only 10 students have been determined as originating from the nobility. A total of 78 citizens of Ducal Prussia were matriculated at the University: 67 came from the cities (of whom 45 were from Königsberg) and 11 from the nobility. The list shows that in Melanchthon's times youths from Royal Prussia studying at Wittenberg were twice more numerous than their counterparts from Ducal Prussia, and that those from Danzig and Königsberg formed the two largest groups (cf. Hermann Freytag, *Die Preussen auf der Universität Wittenberg und die nichtpreussischen Schüler Wittenbergs in Preussen von 1502 bis 1602*, Leipzig, 1903, and Horst Kenkel, *Studenten aus Ost- und Westpreussen an ausserpreussischen Universitäten vor 1815*, Hamburg, 1981, pp. 287–302). These findings explain to a certain degree why the Reformation movement in Ducal and Royal Prussia developed at a considerably faster pace than in Poland.

I have given more attention to this issue because the author failed to conduct prosopographical research. The analysis shows that during the period analysed by the author there were very few followers of Lutheranism in the Crown, and that they did not constitute a threat to the dominance of the Catholic Church. This was still a 'dispute within the family'. Until 1530, when the Augsburg Confession was adopted in Germany, it appeared probable to many that a theological dispute between Protestants and Catholics would be prevented, as had been the case in the fifteenth century. The threat to the 'old Church' in Poland only became real in the 1540s, reaching its climax in 1555, when at the Sejm in Piotrków Trybunalski no less than 113 envoys demanded the adoption of the Augsburg Confession. The book under review touches upon a number of issues that are worthy of more in-depth discussion, for example the tradition and language of religious disputes — both were based on the same notions and terms, however these concepts were interpreted differently by Lutherans and Catholics. It will doubtless be the subject of numerous reviews. Through her valuable study Natalia Nowakowska has broadened our understanding of the early Reformation in Poland.

Janusz Małłek
(Toruń)

(Translated by Maciej Zakrzewski)
(Proofreading by Yelizaveta Crofts)

Zapisy Sądu Duchownego Ormian miasta Lwowa za lata 1564–1608 w języku ormiańsko-kipczackim [Records of the Armenian Spiritual Court of Lwów, 1564–1608 in Armeno-Kipchak language], ed. Edward Tryjarski, Cracow: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2017, 1149 pp., *Rozprawy Wydziału Historyczno-Filozoficznego — Polska Akademia Umiejętności*, vol. 117; *Pomniki Dziejowe Ormian Polskich*, vol. 1, electronic version of the original text is attached

The consistent effort of the outstanding Warsaw orientalist Edward Tryjarski has been completed with another study and publication of an important source. This text from the second half of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century waited 410 years to become available. It was created before the great turmoil of Cossack wars in the Ukraine and the destructive period of the Swedish invasion. It is a unique case, more typical for a lost, loose medieval document or its copy. Records from 1564–1608 are an original manuscript created in the religious community of the Armenian Church in Lwów (L'viv). These records are valuable for many researchers of different qualifications and workshop skills.

Records were made in the Armeno-Kipchak language, which was at that time used by all Armenians in Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The text was not accessible for outsiders, because it was written in the Armenian alphabet. Armenians themselves called their Turkish dialect 'a Tartar language'.¹ The first groups of Armenians appeared in Ruthenia in the twelfth century, and bigger ones appeared in the towns subordinated to the Golden Horde and the Crimean Khanate in the thirteenth and fourteenth century. After taking over the rule over Red Ruthenia, King Casimir the Great granted in 1356 a privilege to the Leopolitans, in which he approved the existence of four different municipal communities which could be ruled according to their own regulations; one of them was Armenian community. We do not know when Armenians began to create written documentation; it could have been created from the very beginning, like in the case of Kamieniec Podolski (Kamianets' Podil's'kyi), which received an urban charter from Prince Alexander Koriatowicz, a Polish vassal, before 1376 (apparently in 1350).²

¹ Edward Tryjarski, 'Ze studiów nad rękopisami i dialektem kipczackim Ormian polskich', *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, 23, 1960, 2, pp. 7–55. Review of works: Edward Tryjarski, *Armeno-Kipchak Studies: Collected Papers*, ed. Marek Mejor and Agata Bareja-Starzyńska, Warsaw, 2017, 1068 pp., *Prace Orientalistyczne — Polska Akademia Nauk*, vol. 43.

² Andrzej Janeczek, 'Zróźnicowanie etniczne wobec integracji państwowej i stanowej w późnośredniowiecznej Polsce', in *Historia społeczna późnego średniowiecza: Nowe badania*, ed. Sławomir Gawlas, Warsaw, 2011, pp. 359–85; Alexander Garkavets, *Qypchaq Written Heritage*, 3 vols, Almaty, 2002–10, vol. 1: *Catalogue and Texts of Monuments Written in Armenian Script: Russian Version*. Jerzy Wyrozumski, 'Kraków i Lwów w średniowiecznej Europie', in *Kraków i Lwów w cywilizacji europejskiej*, ed. Jacek Purchla, Cracow, 2005, pp. 35–45.

It is certain that the fate of particular volumes of records differed. Individual volumes called *defters* (tax registers) had probably been kept in the treasury of the Armenian cathedral until the 1790s. It has not been determined what happened later. A part of records containing entries from the period 1625–30 was forwarded by a priest or an Leopolitan Armenian family to the outstanding orientalist, Mongolia and Turkey scholar Władysław Kotwicz. It could have happened in 1926, when Kotwicz came to Poland and took the Chair at Jan Kazimierz Lwów University. In our opinion, the discovery of sewn files of records from the period 1625–30 could have taken place even a few years earlier. In 1919–20 the Polish-Armenian Society was established in Lwów; it provided help to emigrants from Caucasian countries following their seizure by the Red Army and conducted a lecture campaign. An activist of this Society was Jan Grzegorzewski, a traveller, writer and researcher of the history of Polish-Turkish relations.³

Władysław Kotwicz was busy with lectures and seminars, Mongolian studies and the organization of annual national orientalist congresses, so he did not edit the records. The outburst of war in 1939 took him by surprise during holiday near Wilno (Vilnius), where he spent the whole occupation and died (1944).⁴ Finally, the book of Records from 1625–30 was brought from L'viv to Cracow in 1946 by Marian Lewicki. After his death (1955) the text was held by a scholar of Turkish Studies, Zygmunt Abrahamowicz, who was busy with editorial work and the history of Polish-Turkish relations, so he only made a preliminary reading. The text landed in the Polish Science Archive of the Polish Academy of Sciences (PAN) and Academy of Arts and Sciences (PAU) as late as 1990. This enabled Edward Tryjarski to get access to the source and after four years of work resulted in a perfect publication of this part of Records in 2010.⁵

The history of the older part of Records, from 1564–1608, is also known only partially. In the eighteenth century, old books of the Ecclesiastical Court in Lwów should have been in the archives of the incumbent Catholic-Armenian archbishop. Researchers do not know the circumstances in which they were dispensed from the cathedral treasury. A trustworthy clergyman or man of merit — a secretary of the Ecclesiastical Court should have been fit to keep them safe. One may explore if the fact of leaving the cathedral treasury or archives did not result from implementation of the so-called Josephist reforms in the Habsburg Monarchy (1780–90) and the liquidation in 1784 of separate Armenian courts in the whole state. At that time, the privileges granted to Armenians by Polish kings ceased to have effect. Therefore, after the above date

³ Jan Tyszkiewicz, 'Jan Grzegorzewski w końcowych latach życia: 1916–1922', *Almanach Karaimski*, 4, 2015, pp. 117–26.

⁴ Stanisław Kałużyński, 'Władysław Kotwicz (1872–1944)', *Przegląd Orientalistyczny*, 25, 1972, 2, pp. 103–14; Jan Tyszkiewicz, 'Turkolodzy polscy w czasie II wojny światowej', *Kwartalnik Historii Nauki i Techniki*, 63, 2018, 4, pp. 71–82.

⁵ Edward Tryjarski, *Zapisy Sądu Duchownego Ormian miasta Lwowa za lata 1625–1630 w języku ormiańsko-kipczackim*, Cracow, 2010, RWHF PAU, vol. 111. See: my review: Jan Tyszkiewicz, *KH*, 119, 2012, 2, pp. 403–07.

records of the Ecclesiastical Court could become dispersed. Texts written in the obscure language and obscure Armenian alphabet were unavailable to ordinary Armenians. They must have been kept safe by three consecutive generations, that is, by about a century. Mechitarists Convent with its seat in Vienna conducted a regular campaign of gathering manuscripts and publications which were remnants of Armenians' activity. Records from 1564–1608 were obtained as late as 1895, by Father Bartłomiej Kostecki from the Armenian community in the town of Tyśmienica near Stanisławów. The Tyśmienica collection consisted of approximately twenty different manuscripts. It could be a remnant of Armenian school or the private library of a far-seeing parish priest, for example, Grzegorz Myszoro (from 1849). In 1866 the books survived the fire which destroyed Tyśmienica and the Armenian church.⁶ The Community in Tyśmienica developed in the sixteenth century, the same as in Bar, Podhajce, Jazłów and Zamość. It was relatively wealthy, since at the exhibition of Armenian art (in Lwów in 1932) silver products — dishes and worship objects — were represented mainly by three centres: Lwów, Tyśmienica and Stanisławów.⁷

The edition of the Ecclesiastical Court Records from 1564–1608 consists of: A) an introduction (pp. 7–36), B) the source text in the Armeno-Kipchak language (pp. 37–334), C) a translation into Polish (pp. 335–546) and D) indexes. The content of each page (the obverse of the chart and the reverse of the chart) was published separately. The facsimile of the whole text on CD is attached to the book. The editor explains in the introduction the source knowledge problems, language form and the content of the Records. The comments regarding linguistic influences (grammar, lexicon) in the original text are valuable for linguists and sociologists. Historians and culture researchers will find much source information in the text. Identification and work is facilitated by: the index of Armeno-Kipchak words (pp. 549–744), the index of proper names (pp. 745–80), the index of ethnic names and places/localities (pp. 781–88) and index of Polish words used in the record dated 22 January 1606 of Polish texts written down in Armenian script (chart 164v–165r). The scope of activity of the Ecclesiastical Court of that time should be further studied. Edward Tryjarski does not consider his findings reached until this point to be conclusive.⁸

⁶ Stefan Barącz, *Rys dziejów ormiańskich*, Tarnopol, 1869, pp. 172–75; Jacobus Dashian, *Katalog der armenischen Handschriften in der Mechitharistenbibliothek zu Wien*, Wien, 1895, p. 212; Tadeusz Mańkowski, 'Archiwum lwowskiej katedry ormiańskiej', *Archeion*, 10, 1932, pp. 1–11 (p. 5).

⁷ Czesław Chowanec, *Ormianie w Stanisławowie w XVII i XVIII w.*, Stanisławów, 1928; *Wystawa zabytków ormiańskich we Lwowie*, ed. Tadeusz Mańkowski, Lviv, 1933; Dzhuł'eta O. Galustian, *Kul'turnaia zhizn' armianskikh kolonii srednevekovoi Pol'shi (XVI–XVII vv.)*, Yerevan, 1981; on Tyśmienica: p. 17 and 49.

⁸ *Zapisy Sądu Duchownego Ormian miasta Lwowa za lata 1564–1608* (hereinafter: Records 1564–1608), pp. 10–13; see: Krzysztof Stopka, 'Kultura religijna Ormian polskich: Struktury i stosunki kościelno-publiczne', in *Animarum kultura: Studia nad kulturą religijną na ziemiach polskich w średniowieczu*, ed. Halina Manikowska and Wojciech Brojer, Warsaw, 2008, pp. 229–70 (p. 242 et passim).

In the second half of the sixteenth century assimilation processes in the language of Armenian *kipchakophones* (a term created by Edward Tryjarski) accelerated. Many words regarding construction, clothes, court practices, relationship or craft were acquired. Hybrid expressions appeared: 'holarmen maluczki vislu-chanie' (please, listen to me for a while). The following words were taken over: *jednacz* (conciliator, from Polish verb *jednać*), *wychowonica* (ward), *switlica* (a bigger, representative room), *benkartowy* (ignominious, of worse quality, from the Polish *bękart*, that is, a bastard), *fortel* (ploy) (see Henryk Sienkiewicz's vocabulary in *Potop* (The Deluge)) and so on. There are only few words from Latin (*ar-biter*, *submisja* and so forth). In the 'Introduction' the editor mentions Armenians' areas of life documented in the Records: family relationships, short genealogical studies, clergy and Armenian Church matters, piety norms, customs, learning and reading matters, liabilities and guarantees. The dominating problems, that is trade, caravans, goods, customs, fairs and market stand sale, are relatively briefly presented by the Editor. Family matters were very closely linked with financial activity in all its symptoms (loans, guarantees, debts, partnership, pledges, percent and so on).

Complicated cases were pending before the Court for years: official act of getting engaged or married, divorces and bigamy (more rarely); such cases always had financial consequences. And custom and family honour had to be kept. Things were more complicated if a father or family elders joined the prolonged process of marriage. Annulment of an official engagement revealed the fiscal background of the planned relationship: benefits for girl's father and profits for the fiancé (convenient agreements and guarantees). If wedding was delayed, a woman felt offended and her father suddenly saw too few benefits from the planned relationship: thus, bargaining the terms of marriage continued. Another case: breaking into a maiden's house in the evening and a later escape through the window seemingly ends up amicably. The intruder — Deacon Asvadur — is ordered to immediately get married and leave Lwów. A quick marriage allowed for the avoiding of procedures and many costs. But the deacon and his wife were exiled, in spite of the woman's family's efforts — moral models were cared about.⁹

Towns mentioned in the text (*vide* name index) allow for defining territorial range of trade in Poland — Bełz, Danzig (Gdańsk), Jarosław, Cracow, Lublin, Łuck, Włodzimierz, Zamość, Warsaw, Kamieniec and, in the Middle East — Ajan (Persia), Arindz, Varak, Yerevan (Armenia), Kayseri (Caesarea) and Šam (Damascus in Syria), Tokat and Ankara, Istanbul (Turkey). Thanks to further information we see the circle of contacts covering: Moscow, Livonia, Lithuania, Poland, Moldova, Greece, Turkey, Armenia and Persia.¹⁰ On 20 August 1576 Leopoldian merchants

⁹ Records 1564–1608, fols 152r–155r.

¹⁰ A full picture of the range, trails and trade centres in: Andrzej Dziubiński, *Na szlakach Orientu: Handel między Polską a imperium osmańskim w XVI–XVIII wieku*, Wrocław, 1997, pp. 11–77; tables and link maps: Feliks Kiryk, 'Z dziejów późnośredniowiecznego Kamieńca Podolskiego', in *Kamieniec Podolski. Studia z dziejów miasta i regionu*, ed. idem, 2 vols, Cracow, 2000–05, vol. 1, pp. 67–109.

brought 10 camel saddle-packs of cinnamon and 10 saddle-packs of sugar straight from India.¹¹ Regular income less risky than far travels was earned at the fairs in Lwów, Jarosław, Rzeszów, Lublin, Włodzimierz, Przemyśl, Równe, Skalat, Kamieniec and Kiev. During fairs charity collections were organized (for financial support for the clergy, and redemption of slaves from Tartar captivity).

The Armenian commonalty (the craftsman stratum) demanded in 1591 limitation of luxury and the display of riches. But it was only ten years later that a special Danzig Law was elaborated, which obliged citizens to limit the demonstrational luxury. Council of Elders together with 'all the commonalty' codified regulations counteracting wastefulness and too lax morals (22 paragraphs). They described permitted conduct in public places, the stages of getting married, the exchange of gifts and number of persons at the wedding. Many bans related to female clothes; women could only wear one chain and one bracelet; but they also related to male clothes (a ban on clothes made of satin and damask silk, gold bracelets, decoration with pearls and noble stones) and so on. Breaking these regulations resulted in high financial and church penalties.¹² The important political events — the Union of Lublin and free royal elections — did not much influence Armenians' life. A more detailed analysis of social relations between nations and the middling strata of Lwów may indicate some tensions. From 1592 merchants were supposed to pay tax on silver coins taken abroad. The 'thaler tax' amounted to two florins on 100 thalers. This was a result of negative balance sheet in trade with Orient. Sigismund III Vasa had the increased financial needs connected with the Swedish policy he pursued.¹³ The wealth of Armenian merchants and clergy was subjected to control and drainage.¹⁴

The Armenian community with the Ecclesiastical Court strictly observed the rules of accepting aliens, foreigners, but also Armenians from other towns of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Records documented trials, often very complicated due to a temporary stay of Lwów inhabitants abroad, their multiple marriages, and the legal and religious status of wives and children. A wife who was not Armenian or a daughter not christened in Armenian Church remained outside the law. An example is records relating to the Donawak family.¹⁵ A school was run; it had been mentioned from 1580. Records mention several clergymen-teachers who were carefully selected.¹⁶ Deacon Minas from Tokat was accused of delays in transcribing the ordered books about medicines. The assigning party bothered

¹¹ Records 1564–1608, fols 42v–43v. A saddle-pack amounted approximately to 165 kg: Dziubiński, *Na szlakach Orientu*, Annex 2, p. 292.

¹² Protest against luxury — 1591, fol. 74r, issuance of Danzig Law — 20 March 1601, fols 119v–123v. 'Only' ermine was permitted.

¹³ About the tax on exported thalers: 1592, fols 117v–118v.

¹⁴ Mentions: fol. 105r, 1598, fol. 129v, 1601, fol. 167v, 1606.

¹⁵ fols 30v–46v, 1574–78.

¹⁶ See: Krzysztof Stopka, 'Nieznane karty z dziejów szkolnictwa Ormian, polskich: Szkoła kościelna (tybradun) do XVII w.', in *Virtuti et ingenio: Księga pamiątkowa dedykowana prof. Julianowi Dybcowi*, ed. Andrzej Banach, Cracow, 2013, pp. 477–98.

a teacher and notary of Ecclesiastical Court, who in the following years became famous as a model calligrapher and miniaturist.¹⁷ Other copiers transcribed Armenian texts in Kamieniec. The Cathedral library in Lwów had about 300 items; it was kept in trunks. It was mainly composed of posthumous donations by the clergy. Texts were necessary for conducting the liturgy, for use at school or for lending them for reading or learning to recite (in grabar) (Classical Armenian, *grabar*, meaning 'literary [language]'; along with Old Armenian or Liturgical Armenian, is the oldest attested form of the Armenian language).

Kirkor from Suczawa offered the library 22 items — prints, codexes and manuscripts. They included: calendars, religious books and secular books, such as Michał Syryjczyk's *Chronicle* (translated into Armenian before 1248), two popular works by Wardan Ajgerkce — *Fox's Book* (fairy tales and short stories) and *Wardan's Book* (sermons and parables) and the *silva rerum* titled: *The Book of Golden Thoughts*; texts gathered by the owner (poems, sermons, medical prescriptions).¹⁸ Another clergyman Lustig (died in 1590) left twenty-four books: *Hymnarium* (on parchment, from 1409), alchemy *Book of precious stones/gem* and, among others, two books in Polish and Latin (without titles). Negotiations about union with the Holy See were advanced. A few years later, in 1614, Howannes Karmatanec established a printing house in L'viv, which printed Armeno-Kipchak texts in Armenian fonts. Three red-hot items were printed: a psalm-book, a prayer book and a medical book (1614–18).¹⁹ Alchemy and medicine were popular subjects among wealthy Armenian readers. The fiancé of Zośka Torosowiczówna was accused of witchcraft by her brother Andrew. This is worth mentioning, because Andrzej Torosowicz himself was a well-known alchemist.²⁰

Most of important and precise information in the Records between 1564 and 1608 relate to international and retail trade, living standard of wealthy merchants (detailed property reports, dowries). Lwów's Armenian monastery concluded a unique lease transaction with enterpriser Hadzi Balyj from Ankara. His press for smoothing fustians and dye shop were supposed to be built in the monastery's courtyard. He also leased the whole garden and orchard with a pond

¹⁷ Joanna Rydzkowska-Kozak, *Ormiańskie malarstwo miniaturowe w Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów / Armenian Miniature Painting in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth*, Warsaw and Toruń, 2014, pp. 102–08; Kiryk, *Z dziejów późnośredniowiecznego Kamieńca*; works of Iaroslav Dashkevych.

¹⁸ fol. 60r, 1586. Besides cash, valuable items and books, the deceased left: one quarter of saffron, 1 pound of ginger and 2.5 pounds of pepper.

¹⁹ fol. 65v, 1590. On the theme of the literacy of the Armenians in Poland in 1550–1650: Mirosława Zakrzewska-Dubasowa, *Ormianie w dawnej Polsce*, Lublin, 1982, pp. 223–86; Rafajel Iszchanian, *Książka ormiańska w latach 1512–1920*, Wrocław, 1994, pp. 61–63.

²⁰ fol. 126r, 1601. Spell was allegedly put on by a Turkman disposing with a lock of girl's hair. Cf. Edward Tryjarski, 'Andrzej Torosowicz et son traité d'alchimie', *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, 53, 2000, 1, pp. 9–19; idem, 'Czy polscy alchemicy wschodniego pochodzenia czerpali inspiracje także ze Wschodu?', in *Inter Orientem et Occidentem: Studia z dziejów Europy Środkowoschodniej ofiarowane Profesorowi Janowi Tyszkiewiczowi w czterdziestolecie pracy naukowej*, ed. Tadeusz Wasilewski, Warsaw, 2002, pp. 235–41.

for annual rent of 45 florins.²¹ Entries from 1600–08 do not provide any information about political tensions between Poland and the Ottoman Empire.²² Diplomatic preparations for the war had already begun. Shah Abbas I sent legations to European rulers in 1599, while Sigismund III sent the Armenian Sefar Muratowicz to Persia in 1601. Legations circulated in both directions in 1605–09. Two fermans (a royal mandate or decree issued by a sovereign in an Islamic state) of Abbas I (of 3–18 January 1608) preserved in original version, encouraged Sigismund III to join the Polish-Turkish war.²³

Wealth guaranteed by royal privileges, easy access to the Polish court and their own family titles satisfied the aspirations of more ambitious Armenians for a long time. Only the polonization of their language (the disappearance of the grabar and Kipchak dialect) and culture, religious rapprochement (in Poland, union with the Holy See from 1620) caused Armenians' efforts to be granted nobility. Records from 1625–30 did not reveal this phenomenon yet; it was noticed only in the period 1650–80.²⁴

Jan Tyszkiewicz
(Warsaw)

(Translated by Elżbieta Petrajtis-O'Neill)

Michał Mencfel, *Atanazy Raczyński (1788–1874): Biografia* [Atanazy Raczyński (1788–1874): A Biography], Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu, 2016, 532 pp., *Historia Sztuki*, vol. 42

Picking up the book by Michał Mencfel one may quote the Polish national poem *Pan Tadeusz*: 'Ah, he may be the last! Watch, watch you young men, perhaps he is the last one who can lead the polonaise in such fashion'. It is very rare to get a biography so 'full' — so comprehensive and so perfectly documented. The author has set himself an ambitious and risky task. And at the same time he has made this

²¹ Agreement was in force until the death of both of them, Hadzi and his wife; fols 156v–157v, 19 April 1604. Hadzi Balyj could be an informal Turkish agent.

²² fols until 117v, with the last entry on 28 April 1608.

²³ Report from S. Muratowicz's mission: *Trzy relacje z polskich podróży na Wschód muzułmański w pierwszej połowie XVII wieku*, ed. Adam Walaszek, Cracow, 1980, pp. 35–47; *Stosunki dawnej Rzeczypospolitej z Persją Safawidów i katolikosatem w Eczmiadzynie w świetle dokumentów archiwalnych*, ed. Dariusz Kołodziejczyk, Warsaw, 2017, no. 1–2, pp. 119–45; Dariusz Kołodziejczyk, 'Europejska polityka szaha Abbasa I', in *Stosunki dawnej Rzeczypospolitej z Persją*, pp. 13–25.

²⁴ See: Józef Reczek, 'Językowa polonizacja Ormian', *Język Polski*, 67, 1987, 1/2, pp. 1–8; Ludwik Korwin, *Ormiańskie rody szlacheckie*, Cracow, 1934, pp. 55–188. Of 145 noble families at the beginning of the twentieth century only twelve were granted Polish nobility before 1700; Awak 1605, Urek 1607, Grzegorzowicz 1616, Głuszkiewicz 1624 and others in: 1654, 1655, 1658, 1659, 1662, 1673, 1678. The next ones got it only after 1780.

task even more difficult by selecting such a controversial person as a hero of his research. Among researchers, even several decades ago, there was hardly anyone, who would mention the brother of the generally known Edward Raczyński¹ — Atanazy. If someone did, he was mentioned as the black sheep of the family, who denied his origins and became almost fully Prussian, or as a collector famous at that time, who bequeathed his entire collection to the Prussian conqueror.

Mencfel's book, although it is published thirteen years after the full catalogue of Raczyński's collection,² following which nothing has happened in the state of research, almost completely fills this gap. It is worth stressing here that Mencfel, who is from the same circle of Poznań art researchers, has stepped out of the tradition of his environment. This is a very ambitious but also a desperate step. The researcher is absolutely successful in this struggle, which is confirmed by the nomination to the prestigious Tadeusz Kotarbiński Award (granted by Łódź University), the success of the book (reprints) and the opinion of many specialists on this period that the subject can be considered exhausted.

All that has been so far written puts the reviewer in a difficult situation, because sharing the high evaluation of this monography he should send to the editors the shortest review yet written: 'A perfect book!'. A review, which should be the evaluation of a book, seems useless in this case. Finding minor shortcomings, such as that before the Poniatowski family the Sobieski family also obtained the title of prince from the Polish parliament after the election of Jan III as king, will look like searching for a needle in a haystack. So it seems that the comments on the margin of the book and, first of all, presenting these conclusions of the author, which supplement the image of Raczyński and the political elite of the Polish lands in the first half of the nineteenth century with new elements, is much more interesting.

The value of Mencfel's book is not only the fact that the portrait of Atanazy Raczyński as a collector, which we have known so far, has been balanced by his image as a politician (how powerful is a different matter), but also the fact that consciously or unconsciously this reasoning fits into a great debate on Poles' choices in the *belle époque*. Choices which did not lead all of them to the Beldere in November 1830 and to the forest in January 1863. Many of them went through the offices of the conquerors, but most were tipped by public opinion into the abyss of national infamy. In this situation, the size of the book becomes understandable, since only through balanced and perfectly documented reasoning may the author secure himself against the charge of apotheosizing 'the traitor', a charge — especially in the face of polarized evaluations of the past — is so easily formulated today. But anyone who expects a marble bust

¹ Edward Raczyński (1786–1845) — Polish politician, defender of culture and Polish language in the Grand Duchy of Poznań.

² *Galeria Atanazego Raczyńskiego*, ed. Piotr Michałowski et al., Poznań, 2005.

image of Raczyński, will be wrong. The unbiased, nuanced narration does not omit the psychological side of the count and his vices.

A careful reader will notice significant details already on the cover of this book, since we see a thirty-eight-year-old Raczyński, in the best period of his life, immortalized in the portrait painted by Karl Wilhelm Wach. The Prussian order of the Red Eagle hangs on his neck, and below it, a Polish Virtuti Militari Cross. The first order, which belonged to the most important distinctions in the state of Hohenzollerns, was granted for loyal service; the second — for heroism in battle. For representatives of the domestic political elite of the first half of the nineteenth century such a juxtaposition caused not the slightest surprise. Especially if we realize that the same honours were worn by Prince Józef Ponia-towski, Prince Antoni Henryk Radziwiłł, Prince Józef Zajączek, Prince Ksawery Drucki Lubecki and a distant cousin of Atanazy, Primate Ignacy Raczyński, and many other Poles. But from the 1840s showing off with them, or, especially, accepting them from the conqueror became an incriminating element. On the second preserved portrait of Raczyński as the deputy of Prussian Kingdom in Portugal dated 1843, painted by Auguste Roquemont, we not only see the same Red Eagle order on his neck, but his bust is decorated with a Star of this distinction and probably the Portuguese Order of Christ. There is no trace of the Virtuti Militari... In this context it is significant that on the contemporary lists of persons decorated with these orders we would look in vain for Atanazy. He is not placed on the list of Virtuti bachelors, although his brother Edward is there, and they both were decorated with it for participation in Napoleon wars. He is not present on the list of Poles decorated with the Prussian Red Eagle. This is the best symbol of, on the one hand, the dilemma of this man, his fate, and, on the other, his fate after death — almost total oblivion.

If Raczyński had been asked: 'who are you?' he would have probably answered — as Mencfel's book suggests — that he was a loyal subject of the king of Prussia. For some people this declaration would be clearly a confession of the national apostasy, for others this would be a definition of a statesman and cosmopolitan aristocrat. The author of monography indicates that his goal was to watch Raczyński's choices and to listen to the justification thereof. So little and yet so much. Mencfel is a patient and careful listener — down to the last page he does not formulate verdicts, does not justify, and even in extremely controversial situations he seems to say to the reader: You have all the documents on the table, it is up to you which of them you will use. Is it a good approach? It is surely substantively consistent and implements high standards which a biography of the outstanding or at least important people from the world of politics or culture of the past should be characterized with. But sometimes one would like to hear a bit more *off the record*: what he was really like. But the main character and his monographer do not apply any compromise here. This is why in many places this detailed description deprived of any evaluation loses the tragic fate of Raczyński. Maybe we will see such Raczyński in the announced edition of selection of his journals, which is being prepared by Mencfel.

So who was Atanazy Raczyński, or, more precisely: what is his image that we get in Mencfel's book? First, it is certainly precise and almost complete. Historical precision makes me add the word 'almost', since we are never sure if there are no archives which can either change or complete our image. But even if any materials on Atanazy Raczyński were found, it seems that they would not change the researcher's conclusions, since he got through and looked through archives dispersed around Europe: in London, Copenhagen, Madrid, Lisbon and Berlin, not to mention the domestic sources in Poznań, Warsaw and other places. He got through to the first-class sources, which were not studied before him on such a scale — his huge memoirist and epistolographic heritage. Based on it he creates a 'Self-portrait of Raczyński', subjecting it to analysis and verification. It is the letters and diaries that show 'the last knight of the crumbling world of aristocracy'. In Mencfel's narrative this Polish aristocrat is a typical, and, at the same time, not typical child of his era, as a representative of Polish aristocracy and concurrently representative of the European *monde* of the first half of the century, which is illustrated by hundreds of pages of diaries and letters pages read and analysed by Mencfel.

The matters of politics and art — in this sequence — organize the arrangement of the book, because politics and art were Raczyński's equal passions. And Mencfel brings back these proportions. Moreover, the researcher manages to reconstruct Raczyński's political system, situating him among outstanding representatives of the conservative thought of the period. He describes him — rightly — as 'maybe a not very powerful but active and critical participant and commentator of political life [...], who can be placed among the most important and certainly the most interesting Polish political personalities of the nineteenth century.'³ Is it absolutely true? — we can discuss this with the author. Certainly his outlook was a cohesive construction, to which he was loyal until the end of life, in spite of (or maybe because of) events taking place in Europe. Raczyński defined himself as an absolutist. Loyal to the king, but understood not in the personal but institutional sense — as the foundation of justice and rule of law, as against the usurpation of the liberals, who led the crowds and bore revolutions and destruction. The point of reference for nearly all his choices was his conviction that it is the monarch, who, due to tradition and religion, has a licence to rule, not demagogues elected by the people. These views explain his uncompromising condemnation of all revolutionary movements, which were numerous in Europe during his life. Characterizing Raczyński Mencfel perfectly shows that such an extreme attitude and outlook had to lead to the state of internal conflict, 'a permanent dilemma' and to result in 'hopeless uncompromisingness'. Such an attitude had to lead to conflicts and Raczyński himself to alienation and defeat. It is interesting that this also relat-

³ 'może niezbyt wpływowego, ale aktywnego i obdarzonego krytycznym zmysłem uczestnika i zarazem komentatora życia politycznego [...], którego postawić można pośród najważniejszych, z pewnością najbardziej interesujących polskich osobowości politycznych XIX w.'

ed to his family life, which was evidenced by, initially, breaking relations with the family of his late brother (and excluding them from inheriting the newly created entail), and then, the breakdown of his marriage with Anna Radziwiłłówna and conflict with their only son.

Here I would like to file a firm *votum separatum* from Mencfel's opinion, who sees in this 'hopeless uncompromisingness' of views and attitude of Raczyński the elements of heroism. He may be presented as the last Wajdelota⁴ *à rebours*, who, convinced about defeat, and against pressure, stays at his position. But at his position, with a stable situation and financial abilities, it does not seem such a sacrifice as resignation from all these assets for the proclaimed views.

So the researcher first makes us face the portrait of Raczyński as a politician, who is subject to the greatest resistance, and only at the end he shows his positive image. Raczyński, as a historian, theoretician of art and one of the most outstanding collectors thereof – did not and cannot cause any objections. And we can see that in this respect self-restrictions which the biographer imposed on himself hardly keep such objectified form as before. The positive attitude toward the character is frequently seen. But for Raczyński – as it indirectly results from the book – art, beside its autonomous role, was also supposed to play the service role. And it does not relate to its direct form, that is, decorating residences, but – as we would say today – broadly conceived PR. The collections made available to the public in subsequent residences, which were situated in the representative places of the capital of the state, besides being an attraction were supposed to contribute to improving the prestige of their creator, and to help in his dreamy diplomatic career (but they did not play the key role in this latter case). This was confirmed by, for example, the time of opening the first art gallery in Berlin in 1836 on the birthday of Frederick William III – which was stressed by the researcher.

Finally art, in particular the estate in Gaj Mały (near the town of Szamotuły in Greater Poland), became the last enclave of his world. So it is not surprising that it was there that he located 'the sanctuary of the memory of his house' – a gallery of the portraits of the closer and more distant relatives in the building erected and arranged for this purpose, and he entered it in the statute of the entail. One can add in a small font that besides the description of the collector and historical-artistic passions of Raczyński, the author reconstructs, also in a very comprehensive way, the artistic and political world of the elites of the Hohenzollern state in the mid-nineteenth century. This is important because this area had been, until now, hardly known in the Polish literature on this subject, analogically to the Russian cultural world in Warsaw after 1830.

Last but not least, the problem which Mencfel repeatedly returns to in his book and which is of a key importance for the main character, is worth mentioning. Starting from the clear declaration by Raczyński from 1860: 'Anyone

⁴ Wajdelota – a pagan fortune teller from Lithuania, a hero of the romantic poem by Adam Mickiewicz *Konrad Wallenrod* (1828).

who states that I do not love my country [that is, Poland], lies or is wrong'⁵ he presents it as 'a stigma and obligation, as a burden and challenge'. His relation toward Poland changed according to the political situation and as a result of personal experiences. Passages relating to this question should be considered the most essential for the answer: who was Atanazy Raczyński? Mencfel returns to this problem also in the final part of the book, the punchline of which is the conclusion that one could distance himself from independence but at the same time one could not stop to feel being a Pole. Obviously, it should be added that the temperature of these feelings was sometimes extreme, and in the case of Raczyński it oscillated around the moderate or even very low.

Raczyński cut himself off his compatriots throughout his life. He even did not participate in the activities of the so called Polish Circle in the Chamber of Lords (Herrenhaus), considering it a suspicious company. He hardly maintained traditional contacts with other Polish houses, which — the same as him — loyally served the Berlin throne — not to mention his closest family.

The polarized picture of the nineteenth century as an epoch of sacrifice on the way to independence pushed out the characters from the borderland. These characters, ambiguous and not directly matching the martyrdom panorama of the beautiful century scenery, could not and cannot expect that Poles will remember them. Mencfel does not intend to change this situation with respect to Atanazy Raczyński. Such an endeavour would be difficult to conduct and doomed to failure. It is rather impossible to change opinion about him. And this was not the goal of the book. The author did not want to justify Raczyński, but to explain his choices. To give him the opportunity of, instead of a default judgment, a trial during which he could speak and present his arguments. This was realized completely. The character of Atanazy Raczyński, multivariate, complex and full of internal contradictions, which is visible in his diaries and letters, has found in Mencfel a decent and understanding researcher and biographer.

The book is perfectly documented. It refers not only to many source materials but also to rich literature on the subject and literature of versatile context, which shows an admirable erudition of the scholar. It is completed with superb iconographic material, sometimes from such exotic parts of the continent, to which only Michał Mencfel has followed in the steps of Raczyński. I believe that now I can present a review of this book simply writing about it: PERFECT!

Grzegorz P. Bąbiak
(Warsaw)

(Translated by Elżbieta Petrajtis-O'Neill)

⁵ 'Kto twierdzi, że nie kocham mego kraju [that is Poland], kłamie lub myli się'.

Tomasz Kozłowski, *Anatomia rewolucji: Narodziny ruchu społecznego ‘Solidarność’ w 1980 roku* [Anatomy of Revolution: The Birth of Social Movement ‘Solidarity’ in 1980], Warsaw: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej — Komisja Ścigania Zbrodni przeciwko Narodowi Polskiemu, 2017, 471 pp., Monographies

Although much has been written since 1980 about ‘Solidarity’ and its genesis, for a long time there was no book which analysed the course of workers’ protests in August 1980 in a scholarly fashion, with the use of a broad spectrum of historical sources. The situation changed recently when the European Solidarity Centre published the book *Bunt: Strajki w Trójmieście: Sierpień 1980* (Revolt: Strikes in Trójmiasto: August 1980) by Anna Machcewicz (2015). It received deservedly positive reviews from historians, since this publication presented the reasons, the course and the effects of strikes which broke out in the Pomeranian Voivodeship in August 1980 in a style both attractive for readers — thanks to the journalistic background of the author — and balanced in its perspective.

The book by Tomasz Kozłowski reviewed here should be considered an even greater breakthrough in the research on this ‘Polish month’. Its author was already known through his numerous publications on the history of this social movement and other subjects, notably the prison system in the last decades of Polish People’s Republic, *Niezależne Zrzeszenie Studentów* (The Independent Student Association), farmers’ ‘Solidarity’, political manipulation of political trials in Poland after 1956, the secret details of ‘The Bridge’ operation (regarding Jews’ emigration from the USSR to Israel through Poland) and the establishment of commercial companies co-owned by nomenclature in the last years of the Polish People’s Republic. Kozłowski’s current project is a book on the reform of Polish intelligence services during the system transformation in Poland in 1989–90.

The author has to a large extent set himself challenges still more ambitious than those undertaken by Machcewicz. His book describes the events which took place not only in the Tri-City (*Trójmiasto*) of Gdańsk, Gdynia and Sopot, but throughout Poland. Kozłowski takes note of events preceding the August 1980 strikes — for example, he provides a detailed analysis of the July strikes, which are often summarized in a few sentences by other researchers — and his analysis takes into account a further stage of revolution then initiated: the first weeks of the trade union’s operation. The author’s period of interest ends with the registration of ‘Solidarity’, that is the trade union’s formal legalization. Nevertheless, the major difference between *Bunt* and *Anatomia rewolucji* is the adoption of a different approach and research goal. Machcewicz successfully reconstructed the events of summer 1980 in a typical historical manner, whereas Kozłowski has gone further, making a large number of factual findings and providing a multi-layered analysis of the events described, in which he uses categories applied by sociologists and political scientists to studies of social movements.

It is easy to notice the influence of Kozłowski's teacher Marcin Kula. Under his supervision Kozłowski defended his PhD dissertation in the social sciences related to political science in the spring of 2016. This thesis constitutes the basis of his book. After reading *Anatomia rewolucji* I have no doubt that Kozłowski may be included in the historical school created by Kula, characterized by the wide use of sociological methods in historical research. The title of the book, as Kozłowski has admitted, refers to his dissertation supervisor's classic work titled *Anatomia rewolucji narodowej (Boliwia w XX wieku)* (Anatomy of National Revolution (Bolivia in the Twentieth Century), 1999). The tendency to introduce inter-disciplinary approaches to his research were visible in Kozłowski even earlier. In his 2010 book *Bunt w bydgoskim areszcie śledczym w 1981 roku: Przejaw choroby więziennictwa w schyłkowym okresie PRL* (Revolt in Bydgoszcz Custody in 1981: A Symptom of Prison System Sickness in the Decadent Period of PRL, 2010) Kozłowski, while presenting complex reasons behind the protests of criminal prisoners, used the output of such sciences as re-socialization and criminology.

In *Anatomia rewolucji* Kozłowski's inter-disciplinary approach is much clearer. It results, as the author admits, from the perception of a certain incompleteness in the research on 'Solidarity' conducted separately by sociologists and historians. In book's introduction he states: 'Historians find and verify sources, describe facts, reconstruct the cause and effect process. They consider their work to be finished when they describe "what it was like", usually resigning from an attempt to compare, generalize or provide a synthesis'. Looking at the growing number of studies on the history of 'Solidarity' in different centres, which provide an enormous number of facts but few conclusions, this statement seems plausible. At the same time, Kozłowski is critical about the work of other researchers. 'But the aforementioned sociologists and political scientists usually use studies, not archive sources. The sense of their work is to construct consistent theoretical framework; a cogitation, which for a historian often seems to be a mere hypothesis'.

The author postulates, and more importantly, implements an approach combining the methods of both disciplines. Nevertheless he is clearly a historian. 'It is history, and, therefore, the historical method is the key element in this book, whereas sociology and political science play the role of supporting sciences. The basis of this work were sources and historical studies, which I attempted to complement using theoretical reasoning on revolution, mass mobilization or social movements, but correlation to historical findings was always the criterion of the usefulness of the theory. Adopting such practice is connected with a certain risk. It may be assumed with all likeliness that historians will criticize the insufficiency of the sources' — writes Kozłowski modestly, although it seems unlikely since his source base is extensive — 'while sociologists and political scholars will criticize insufficient theoretical expertise. Nevertheless, it seems that such an approach allows for a clear enhancement of our knowledge and progress beyond clichés'.

Kozłowski mentions two individuals whose research approach was particularly formative to his work. The first one is Marcin Kula, and the second — Walter Goldfrank. He writes about them in the following way: ‘The first of them is a historian who always aimed at conducting inter-disciplinary research, the effect of which was, for example, an inspiring book *Narodowe i rewolucyjne* [National and Revolutionary, 1991]. The second is a sociologist who deals, among other things, with the problems of revolution. He is the only scholar I know to have stated that being unable to effectively incorporate his study of revolution in Mexico into the earlier developed theories in the face of empirical and source-based research, [...] he stopped aiming at the construction of a general model’. One may mischievously comment that with this statement Kozłowski created a certain model of the environment of sociologists, in which he included all researchers *en bloc*. But we cannot dispute that the author is right when he sums up this line of thought by writing: ‘In my opinion this is the road which is worth following: on the one hand, not to limit oneself to the exhaustive analysis of sources, and on the other — not to absolutize theory’.

The key categories used by the author in his analysis are the concepts of ‘revolution’, ‘social movement’, ‘revolutionary social movement’ and ‘social mobilization’. Regarding their meaning the author refers to the works of both theoreticians and researchers dealing with the contemporary and historical events (such as the promoter of historical sociology Charles Tilly, the author of a book on European revolutions in the period 1492–1992). Kozłowski considers ‘Solidarity’ to be a ‘revolutionary social movement’. Regarding the features of the phenomenon of revolution he refers both to past events and to contemporary ones. He mentions the case of non-violent revolutions, a key issue in his subject of study. He calls ‘Solidarity’ a ‘hybrid revolution’ and believes that its key elements include its participants’ initiation of new social networks, emergence of a common identity and the implementation of changes in the state of social self-awareness.

The book’s bibliography shows the multidimensionality of the author’s research and inspiration. His broad use of foreign literature should be appreciated. Kozłowski, who is foremost a historian, conducted an extensive search for sources. His footnotes refer to documents from the Archiwum Akt Nowych (State Archives) collection (sections: CC PUWP, the Ministry of Justice, the General Prosecutor’s Office, Council of Ministers Office), the Archiwum Instytutu Pamięci Narodowej (Institute of National Remembrance Archives) (in Warsaw, Gdańsk, Szczecin and Wrocław), the National Commission of Independent Self-Governing Trade Union ‘Solidarity’ in Gdańsk, Karta Centre Archives (collection of Solidarity Archives Association) and Ossolineum Library in Wrocław. Due to this we have a rather equally distributed overview of materials created by the ruling authority structures and by participants of the emerging social movement. As far as facts relating to the events of the strikes are concerned, Kozłowski mainly refers to the first type of sources, while analysing the mechanisms of the movement’s development he mostly uses the latter group. Mem-

ories, journals and interviews of the strikes' participants were useful here, but so was the evidence provided by representatives of the other side of the dispute, that is the authorities.

Before Kozłowski turns to the characteristically analytical part of his work, he presents several dozen pages of synthetic but simultaneously detailed description concerning events between July and October 1980 based on his source-based research. It is not possible to present all his findings here, but it is worth mentioning his description of the key moment of the strike in the Gdańsk Shipyard on 16 August. The demands of the shipyard workers were accepted and the strike for a while was put on hold. It was subsequently resumed already in the cause of solidarity, since its participants demanded the fulfilment of demands presented not only by the workers of a single enterprise, but across all enterprises. Kozłowski dissects the myths which increasingly tend to dominate in historical narratives of this event. Put as simply as possible: it was allegedly a relatively docile Lech Wałęsa who ended the strike, going against the opinion of Anna Walentynowicz, and she saved him by keeping the workers in the shipyard, together with Alina Pienkowska and Ewa Ossowska.

Of course there are elements of truth in this version of events, but Kozłowski is the first one to display all its complexity. First, by referring to numerous sources he clearly shows that the majority of the shipyard workers were tired with the protest and had demanded its end. Second, it is a myth that workers were kept in only by the actions of Ossowska, Pienkowska and Walentynowicz — they are the most remembered, but Kozłowski proves that other individuals were also involved. Third, contrary to Anna Walentynowicz' accounts made in later years and to historians who have since uncritically repeated her, at that time there was no dispute between Walentynowicz and Wałęsa on this matter. Walentynowicz did not initially protest against the decision to end the strikes, and she was present when the strike committee made this decision. Kozłowski proves this clearly through reference to available sources. In a 1980 interview Walentynowicz recounted the agreement with the shipyard's management in the following way: 'And — strangely enough — we agreed to it and Mr. Wałęsa announced that the strike was finished. But later we realized — it was really a while later — what would happen to those enterprises which had helped us'. Moreover, as Kozłowski stresses, in a November 1980 meeting with workers in Łódź she defended Wałęsa: 'We voted for it: the strike is finished, we leave the shipyard. It was only then, and we were so tired because everything had happened so quickly, that I called a break since Lech Wałęsa had no microphone; he was hoarse, his vocal cords were broken and he could not speak [...] we go outside and then it happens that the crew ask us with tears in their eyes, "What have you done?"'. These accounts given before the escalation of conflict and radicalization of attitudes should be considered more reliable than the later accounts by Walentynowicz condemning Wałęsa for a decision allegedly made by him alone. But a different picture is given in many publications. It is a pity that Kozłowski's book is not more polemic on this matter, as well as on others.

Anatomia rewolucji describes the genesis of mass strikes extensively. Referring to numerous sources the author displays the widespread feeling of relative deprivation, the sense of abasement and inequality (which resulted, he emphasizes, in the dignity facet of the protest), the authorities' departure from ideology and awareness of their own corruption. The author emphasizes the experience of strikes from previous years, referring not only to the well-known 'Polish months' but also minor economic protests which broke out regularly in the 'Gierek decade' (the 1970s). The necessary element for revolution to materialize was the ideology which bonded the emerging social movement. Kozłowski mentions its internally differentiated nature and the significance for its emergence of the Twenty-One Demands, especially that of establishing independent, self-governing trade unions. Kozłowski writes quite a lot about the significance of religion: 'In the case of the strike in Pomerania voivodeship we have on the one hand an attachment to religious symbols and ceremonies, which allowed for the formation of an emotional community. On the other — a conviction that this struggle was not a matter for the Church, which in any case took the stance of an observer and the voice of common sense'. It is worth pointing out that in support of this thesis's validity Kozłowski refers to minutes of a meeting held by the Main Council of the Polish Episcopate — a source not easily available to most historians. Other important factors included the crisis of the Polish communist authorities, which the book describes in detail, and activities of the democratic opposition led by the Free Trade Unions of Pomerania.

The analysis of the strike wave itself is probably the book's single most valuable contribution. The author has worked hard to gather statistical materials on the protests which took place in July, August, and — often forgotten — also in September 1980. One of the main issues which interests Kozłowski is the strike wave's spread. In July 1980 strikes broke out spontaneously; as the author mentions, an important role was played by the news about other successful protests, broadcast by the Polish station of Radio Free Europe.

Kozłowski's presentation of protests in the Pomerania voivodeship in August 1980 is very interesting. In the chapter titled 'Republika strajkowa' (The Strike Republic) he describes the everyday life of shipyard workers, their emotions (positive and negative), and the circulating rumours. He has not forgotten about the leaders of the 'strike republic' indicating differences between Wałęsa, who was older, well-known by the workers, and was elected chairman — and the significantly younger Andrzej Kołodziej from Gdynia shipyard, who came to the leadership by virtue of his activities.

Kozłowski categorizes different actors in those events, such as the experts who advised the striking workers and social movement brokers, whom he calls 'political tourists' and 'political emissaries'. He writes of them: 'Tourists found themselves in the Pomerania voivodeship by accident; they forwarded information about observed events *en passant*, not expecting to achieve any particular effect. Political emissaries had in turn a specific goal and were not accidental persons. Those who were sent, for example, from Gdańsk to other centres, were

supposed to aim at the spread of protests and winning support for their demands. Those who converged on Pomerania from other centres mostly sought advice on how to organize themselves, to express their support and ask for support in return'. The contacts and social networks created at that time were of key importance not only during the strikes themselves but also in the first weeks of establishing the union.

Kozłowski appreciates the importance of new systems of communication which enabled the strikes. Besides direct communications he largely discusses clandestine publications, leaflets and public announcement systems. They also played an important role after the signing of the accords. On the whole when writing about the emerging social movement Kozłowski does not treat 31 August 1980 as a key turning point, although he states that it had major significance for the movement's change of character from spontaneous to one more organized. Writing about the establishment of the trade union, Kozłowski mentions numerous activities aimed at slowing down its members' social mobilization, which nevertheless were unsuccessful and the union was registered. It is worth mentioning that the author had already published very interesting documents about the backstage manipulation of this matter by the authorities of Polish People's Republic.

In sum, Kozłowski's work is the fullest historical study of the foundational moment that was August '80 and the establishment of 'Solidarity'. The main value of this work lies in its inter-disciplinary character, practical application of theory, in-depth source inquiry, and its courage in formulating its own interpretations. At the same time Kozłowski evidently writes of these events in a way divorced from the disputes between historians on the subject. I am a bit disappointed by the lack of a polemical claw in this book. Kozłowski presents his vision of events without necessarily referring to theses presented by other researchers, including ones that are very well-known and politically defined. I would consider this a shortcoming, but perhaps, given the continuous invasion of political disputes into historiography, the author's restraint should be considered a virtue?

Jan Olaszek
(Warsaw)

(Translated by Elżbieta Petrajtis-O'Neill)
(Proofreading by Yelizaveta Crofts)