

A Companion to Ostrogothic Italy, edited by Jonathan J. Arnold, M. Shane Bjornlie and Kristina Sessa, Leiden and Boston, MA: Brill, 2016, 551 pp., Brill's Companions to European History, vol. 9

Ostrogothic Italy — the term we usually apply to the state that emerged after the victory of Theoderic the Great over another barbarian king, Odoacer — has long attracted and continues to attract the interest of scholars. The edited volume reviewed here is yet another attempt made over the last thirty years to provide a comprehensive analysis of key problems associated with the history of the Ostrogoths. 2007 saw the publication of a — moderately successful — edited volume entitled *The Ostrogoths from the Migration Period to the Sixth Century: An Ethnographic Perspective*.¹ Much earlier, in 1995, a very uneven — in terms of the quality of its articles — volume was published as *Teodorico e i Goti tra Oriente e Occidente*.² 1993 was marked by the publication of the best of all these volumes, *Teodorico il Grande e i Goti d'Italia: Atti del XIII Congresso internazionale di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Milano, 2-6 novembre, 1992*.³ Do we, therefore, need a new edited volume — this time published by the prestigious Brill publishers in the Brill's Companions to European History series? The authors and the editors of the volume under review explain that they were prompted to embark on this ambitious venture by two considerations. The first was a lack of a systematizing and comprehensive study of the problems of Ostrogothic Italy. The second was the growing interest in the history of barbarian kingdoms, like the *regnum* ruled by the Gothic dynasty of Amali. Should we agree with them that such a volume was needed? And should we agree that the venture has been a success? Before I answer these questions, let me briefly discuss the articles included in the volume.

The collection begins with a short introduction explaining the structure of the volume and briefly discussing its contents. The first study — by Gerda Heydemann — is devoted to the political ideology of the Amali dynasty as well as the question of whether Ostrogothic Italy was, as a state, a continuation of Imperial Italy or, rather, a new entity, a Gothic *regnum* that was a barbarian kingdom in all respects. The article contributes little to the debate, although it was an excellent

¹ *The Ostrogoths from the Migration Period to the Sixth Century: An Ethnographic Perspective*, ed. Sam J. Barnish and Federico Marazzi, Woodbridge, 2007, Studies in Historical Archaeoethnology.

² *Teodorico e i Goti tra Oriente e Occidente*, ed. Antonio Carile, Ravenna, 1995.

³ *Teodorico il Grande e i Goti d'Italia: Atti del XIII Congresso internazionale di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Milano, 2-6 novembre, 1992*, Spoleto, 1993.

opportunity to say something new about Theoderic the Great's ideology of power and strategies employed to legitimize the rights of his successors.⁴ Unfortunately, the opportunity has been wasted.

M. Shane Bjornlie's overview is dedicated to the governmental administration of the Ostrogothic kingdom. It is part of the years-long debate over whether Theoderic's kingdom was a continuation of the Roman Empire or a completely new entity. Bjornlie believes that the administration of the Ostrogothic *regnum* was the same as the previous Roman administration, but operated on a much smaller scale and in very different conditions.

There is little new to be found in the contribution by Jonathan J. Arnold, who devotes his attention to the administration and political ideology of the Ostrogothic provinces. The provinces seized by Theoderic — for example Gaul and Pannonia Sirmiensis — were, in a way, reincorporated into the Roman *res publica*. Works by Cassiodorus provided a variety of reasons why these provinces should be incorporated into Italy. The author stressed, for example, their former existence as part of the Roman Empire, while the takeover of power over Gaul was justified by the fact that its seizure by Theoderic meant a restoration of *civilitas* (life according to the law) within its territory with a simultaneous rejection of savagery/barbarity (*saevitia/feritas*).

Federico Marazzi focuses on cities in Ostrogothic Italy. Using archaeological material, he claims — largely contrary to historians' vision of the early Middle Ages as a period characterized by a decline of urban areas — that cities were neither dead nor deserted, but were developing as they had in the fifth century. The cities — claims Marazzi — were used by Theoderic as a place where the process aimed at a peaceful coexistence of Goths and Romans, a process he controlled, was going on.

Christine Radtki discusses the role of the Roman Senate in the politics of the Ostrogothic kingdom. Following earlier findings, she believes that Theoderic used the Senate elite primarily in his negotiations with the Eastern Roman Empire over recognition of his rule and legitimization of Eutharic's succession. Apart from that, its role in the *res publica* ruled by Theoderic was slight — the Senate played no major part in the governance of the state.

In his study of the law in Amal Italy, Sean Lafferty sides with those scholars who claim that Theoderic kept the legal institutions and procedures of the late

⁴ The ongoing research on Jordanes' *Getica* continues to provide new research questions. Let us take the problem of legitimization of Eutharic Cilliga's succession (which ultimately did not happen). The fragment describing this Amal reads as follows: 'prudencia et virtute corporisque integritate pollentem' — Iordanes, *De origine atribusque Getarum*, c. 298, in *Iordanis Romana et Getica*, ed. Theodorus Mommsen, Berlin, 1882, MGH Auctores antiquissimi, vol. 5, part 1, p. 135. It is worth reflecting on whether these three qualities do not correspond to the components of Georges Dumézil's tripartite model — wisdom, valour and beauty, which, according to this scholar, was a prerequisite for any candidate to ascend the throne, see idem, *Mythe et Épopée*, vol. 2: *Types épiques indo-européens: un héros, un sorcier, un roi*, Paris, 1998, p. 338.

imperial administration. When it comes to the law itself, Lafferty suggests that it was an amalgam of various traditions and customs, the objective of which was to simplify and popularize the classic Roman legal system.

Guy Halsall's article — contrary to its title, 'The Ostrogothic Military' — deals with various issues which sometimes have little to do with the military matters of the Ostrogoths — the ethnicity, economy and politics of Justinian. To some extent it is a continuation of the sharp and fierce discussion with Walter Goffart about the installation of Theoderic's warriors in Italy. We do not learn much about the weapons, logistics and tactics of the Ostrogothic army, as a result of which the title, frankly speaking, does not really match the content of the article.

Brian Swain writes about the most frequently discussed problem when it comes to the Ostrogoths — the Gothic identity. He presents the debate between the advocates of an instrumental (situational) nature of Gothic ethnicity (for example, Patrick Amory) and the adherents of primordial ethnicity (for example, Peter Heather), without siding clearly with any of them. However, he does agree with the former that the identity of the Gothic army was not ethnic but merely social.

Deborah M. Deliyannis focuses on questions associated with urban life and culture. According to this scholar, Theoderic construction policy, consisting in erecting new buildings and renovating old ones, was intended to generate enthusiasm for the Roman urban life and culture in the heterogenic (in ethnic terms) population of his kingdom.

Cam Grey discusses the problem of agriculture and rural estates. He calls into question the thesis that the Ostrogoths came to Italy during a period of transformation of the late Roman world from one dominated by cities and rural estates into one in which the main role was played by villages. In doing so, he demonstrates how new interpretations of archaeological evidence undermine this thesis.

Kate Cooper analyses Procopius of Caesarea's account concerning Theoderic's daughter Amalasuētha. In trying to unveil the past reality hidden by Procopius' colourful description, she adds interesting arguments supporting Daniel Frankforter's thesis that Amalasuētha wanted to save Italy from Justinian's imperialist designs, and that her conflict with Theodahad, which ultimately led to the death of the Gothic queen, was a result of intrigue by the emperor's wife, Theodora.⁵

Natalia Lozovsky focuses her attention on the culture and literature of Theoderic's state. Her article is, in fact, a brief discussion of the most important authors active in Ostrogothic Italy, including Cassiodorus, Symmachus, Ennodius and Boethius.

⁵ Daniel Frankforter, 'Amalasuētha, Procopius, and a Woman's Place', *Journal of Women's History*, 8, 1996, 2, pp. 41–57.

Mark J. Johnson's article is an overview of the problems of art and architecture in Ostrogothic Italy, generally continuing the theses formulated in a much earlier study by the same author.⁶ Johnson claims and that construction during the reign of the Amali dynasty was based on two pillars which he calls antiquarism and revivalism. Thanks to his building programme Theoderic wanted to put himself on a par with the ancients and restore everything to its original state. The propaganda message behind these ventures was to demonstrate that the Amali were worthy successors to the Roman emperors.

Paolo Squatriti tackles issues that are extremely original in medieval studies — environment and spatial development in Ostrogothic Italy. He discusses actions taken by the rulers of the kingdom to use the resources provided by the lands of the Italian Peninsula as best as possible.

Kristina Sessa examines the role of the Catholic Church in the Amal state. Her observations indicate that previous studies devoted to the topic are characterized by a surprising number of theses with no real grounding in the sources.

Two articles by Rita Lizzi Testa are also devoted to the history of the Catholic Church during the reign of the Amals. In the first of these she discusses the role of Catholic bishops in the political life of the Ostrogothic state. In the second she examines the territorial organization of the Catholic Church in Italy. The value of the study lies in the fact that the author has corrected many of the previous findings concerning the dates of the founding of some dioceses.

The last study, by Samuel Cohen, is devoted to the religious make-up of Theoderic's state. When discussing Theoderic's attitude to the Jews, the scholar points out that the Amal ruler's policy with regard to this minority was not dictated by tolerance — as it often thought — but, above all, by his desire to maintain social order in line with the ideal of *civilitas*. When it comes to Arianism, Cohen argues that authors like Cassiodorus or Pope Gelasius I made a distinction in their writings between the Arian heresy and the Ostrogothic religion, and believed that only the former deserved to be condemned. What constitutes the article's weakness is its author's uncritical approach to *Anonymus Valesianus*; for example, when Cohen is convinced of the veracity of the information about corporal punishments for every Roman who was unable to financially support the rebuilding of Jewish synagogues destroyed during anti-Jewish riots.

The volume as a whole raises considerable doubts in many respects. Reservations must be voiced regarding the use of the literature on the subject. We will not find here any references to important studies dealing with the history of the Goths by Ludwig Schmidt, John Michael Wallace-Hadrill and Gerd Kamper. The literature on Procopius of Caesarea is especially limited; for example, there are no Berthold Rubin's studies. The same can be said about the literature on Jordanes. We can also have considerable reservations about the articles tackling the problem of ethnicity because of their rather feeble use of eth-

⁶ Mark J. Johnson, 'Toward a History of Theoderic's Building Program', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 42, 1988, pp. 73–96.

nological literature. For example, there is no room for the basic works on the subject by Steve Fenton and Marcus Banks. In addition, the authors fail to see that the polarization of views between the primordialists and the instrumentalists with regard to the very nature of ethnicity is no longer as clear as it was a decade ago, with many scholars adopting positions somewhere in between.

The book is not free from basic errors either. On page 85 we learn that Gesalec died in 514. Yet, in fact, no certain date of his death is known. On page 296 we are informed that Amalasuetha was Theoderic's only daughter, although in reality the Gothic king had (at least) two more daughters — Ostrogotho and Thiudigotho. On page 297 it is said that in 519 Eutharic held the consulship with Theoderic, while in fact the other consul that year was Emperor Justin I. On the same page we read that Athalaric was born in 519. However, the young Gothic king was born either in 516 or in 518. On the following page we learn that Amalaberga and Theodahad were the children of the King of the Vandals Thrasamund, although it is known that both came from Amalafrika's first marriage to a man whose name we do not know. When his father Eutharic died (522/523), Athalaric was apparently eight years old (p. 31). This is not correct, because, according to Procopius, when Theoderic died (in 526) Athalaric was eight years old; Jordanes claims that he was ten at the time. Moreover, the wedding of Eutharic and Amalasuetha took place in 515, so it is easy to calculate that Athalaric could not have been eight years old in 522. Such serious errors should not be found in a book that purports to be the basic compendium of the history of Ostrogothic Italy.

There are also strange comments and assertions in the book. For example, when considering the identity of the Skiri (only three of whom are known by name — Edecon, Odoacer and Onoulphus), G. Halsall wonders (p. 174) whether it was ethnic or familial in nature. Does the very existence of the Skirian *gens* not automatically determine the existence of the Skirian ethnic identity? Atilla's polyethnic subjects apparently had several levels of ethnic identity in addition to their main identity — that of the Huns (p. 173). Does the author believe then that the Ostrogoths of King Valamir had two identities — Gothic and Hunnic, with the latter being more important? Even stranger assertions can be found in the article by P. Squatriti, who refers to the 'specifically Ostrogothic ecology' without, however, explaining what the term is supposed to mean (p. 390). On page 487 we read about the 'Ostrogothic Church', although the author means here the Catholic Church in Italy.

The book is marked by a considerable lack of precision, which culminates in Heydemann's article. The author claims (p. 28) that the Goths, according to the *Variae epistolae* (III, 23, 3), were apparently capable of combining military power with Roman culture and law, but what the source actually says is just that the Goths inherited the valour/manliness (*virtus*) of the barbarian peoples (*gentes*) and acquired the prudence (*prudencia*) of the Romans. Alaric II apparently died at Vouillé (p. 29). Yet the location of the battle between the King of the Visigoths and the Franks is not certain, and the author should mention that or use source

names like Campus Vogladensis, Boglada or Voglada. When depriving Gesalec of power, Theoderic the Great apparently acted in favour of his grandson Amalaric (p. 29). Yet given the fact that Theoderic himself seized the Visigothic throne and ruled the Visigoths until his death, it could be said that Amalaric did not play any major part in his plans. During Theoderic's reign Spain was apparently part of the Ostrogothic kingdom (p. 29–30). However, we have no information about the incorporation of Visigothic Spain into Theoderic's *res publica*, unless the author means that both Italy and *Regnum Visigotharum* had the same ruler, Theoderic.

I asked two questions at the beginning of the review. The answer to the first question is: yes, such a comprehensive study is very much needed. The answer to the second question is, unfortunately, negative. This edited volume is written mainly by young scholars and this is precisely where its main shortcoming lies. A thorough mastery of the literature on the subject requires many years and this is why publishing such a synthesizing study would make sense, if its authors included older, established scholars better prepared for such a venture.

Robert Kasperski
(Warsaw)

(Translated by Anna Kijak)

Legitimation von Fürstendynastien in Polen und dem Reich. Identitätsbildung im Spiegel schriftlicher Quellen (12.–15. Jahrhundert), edited by Grisca Vercamer and Ewa Wólkiewicz, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2016, 400 pp., Deutsches Historisches Institut Warschau. Quellen und Studien, vol. 31

The present publication contains the proceedings of a conference organized in December 2012 by the German Historical Institute in Warsaw. The papers included in it are devoted largely to strategies for identifying and legitimizing territorial rule both in Poland and in Germany from the twelfth until the early sixteenth century, with a special emphasis being placed on demonstrating comparable or individual strategies of local rulers seeking to legitimize their power through written evidence like chronicles and documents. The need to have a written history of the origins of one's family stemmed from the fact that many late medieval families, like the Hohenzollerns, the Habsburgs or the Luxembourgs, had very modest beginnings and, consequently, initially played an insignificant, at best regional role. The need was not as strong in Poland, because the various duchies were ruled by representatives of the House of Piast, who were able to draw on the idea of natural lords; yet here, too, dukes tried to set themselves apart from other rulers, to emphasize the importance of their territorial domains and legitimize their power. Among the many meanings of the term 'legitimization', its most important aspect in this specific case is the fact that it symbolized a continuation of the rightful dynasty, which was key to maintaining peace and order in the country. On the other

hand, when it comes to the notions of 'identification' or 'identity', it should be noted that in the Middle Ages people felt more attached to the area in which they lived than to some supraregional entity. In order to create it, terms like house, country or origin were used. A special role in the process was played by the term 'domus/house'. In the late Middle Ages it comprised not only ducal families but also their subjects, which led to the emergence of a collective identity of sorts.

The papers included in the present volume are grouped under three unnumbered headings. The first group ('Überblicksbeiträge') is devoted to general problems and is to explain the structural background of the subject indicated by the title. The papers included under the second ('Historiographie und Legitimation/Identität von Fürstendynastien im Reich') and third heading ('Historiographie/Urkunden und Legitimation/Identität von Fürstendynastien in Polen') tackle specific legitimization strategies of a given dynasty, first in Germany and then in Poland.

The first group opens with a paper by Jörg Rogge ('Identifikation durch Diskurs? Kommunikation über Gleichheit, Brüderlichkeit und Haus', pp. 21–27), who, using the Houses of Wettin, Wittelsbach and Habsburg as examples, demonstrates that in the late Middle Ages a discussion was started about a transpersonal dynastic motive, a discussion that pushed aside reflection on the deeds of the various representatives of these houses. In the next paper ('Eine Dynastie oder mehrere? Herrschaft und ihre Legitimation in der politischen Kultur Polens (12.–13. Jahrhundert)', pp. 29–54) Marcin Pauk argues that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the Piasts used three methods in particular to visualize and immortalize their rule: a) through documents and coins, b) through transfer of family names (for example Bolesław/Boleslaus) and c) through the cult of saints, with two elements being quite specific to Poland — first of all, a lack of a saint among the members of the ruling family and, secondly, the dynamism and innovation in the growth of Silesia, which stemmed from the fact that it drew on models from the territory of the German empire. Like J. Rogge, Jan Hirschbiegel ('Herr, Hof und Herrschaft. Zur Begegnung von Dynastie und Land', pp. 55–69) points to the consolidation, in the late Middle Ages, of the notion of 'domus/house', which at this point encompassed not just a specific dynasty but also the country and its inhabitants. To end this group of papers, Steffen Schlinker ('Territorialisierung und Dezentralisierung von königlichen Rechten im Spätmittelalter im Prozess der Territorialstaatsbildung', pp. 71–94) outlines the historical legal framework of the development of German principalities, from the times of Frederick Barbarossa until the beginning of the early modern period, stressing that regalia were associated precisely with these principalities and that they could not be seen as allodial titles of a given family. In addition, the scholar notes that the passing of regalia to ecclesiastical or secular magnates was not a disaster or sale of the ruler's powers, but was a prerequisite for exercising them in the first place.

The second group of papers, devoted to legitimization strategies in Germany, begins with Grischa Vercamer's paper ('Die Welfen in der "Historia Welforum":

Ihre Identifikation mit der süddeutschen Region und ihre Verortung im Reich', pp. 97–129) showing Bavaria and Swabia as the central region of the House of Welf, with Saxony being left completely on the sidelines. When it comes to the attitude to the king/emperor, it is possible to distinguish three stages in the chronicle devoted to this family: a) free family not bound by any feudal allegiance, with a status equal to that of the royal family; b) the main family in the country, ruling its territory without any hindrance, subordinated to the emperor of its own accord; and c) justification of the family's disobedience to the king/emperor in the eleventh and twelfth centuries as defence of its sovereignty. Oliver Auge ('Der Beitrag der mittelalterlichen Chronistik zur Legitimation der Herzöge von Pommern und Mecklenburg', pp. 131–57) examines the question of the unity of the Pomeranian House of Griffins, the country and its population as represented by Ernst von Kirchberg, Albert Kranz, Johannes Bugenhagen and others. Attempts were made at the time to counterbalance the relatively late Christianization of Pomerania by disseminating the legend that Wolin had been founded by Julius Caesar and even that the ruling dynasty descended from one of Alexander the Great's commanders. On the other hand, the tradition giving the ruling family Slavic roots, was being replaced with the legend linking the rulers to the Vandals or the Herules. The royal status attained in the past, family links to emperors and good relations with them were to make up for the rather late rise of the Griffins to the rank of Princes of the Holy Roman Empire and to thwart the Hohenzollers' designs. In the next paper ('Legitimation durch Kontinuität: Die Geschichtsschreibung über die Wittelsbacher und das Herzogtum Bayern im Spätmittelalter', pp. 159–73) Joachim Schneider begins his analysis from the accusation, formulated by Otto of Freising, of treason by one of the Wittelsbachs' ancestors, treason that in 955 enabled the Hungarians to penetrate deep into the Kingdom of the East Franks. In response, in addition to explaining the reasons behind the deed, the Wittelsbachs were linked to the Carolingians. The motive, later expanded, linked the Wittelsbachs to Bavaria on the imperial level, while Veit Arnpeck (1440–1496) did it on the regional level, seeing in the Wittelsbachs descendants of the Luitpoldings. Katrin Bourrée's paper ('Die Meistererzählung von den "treuen Dienern": Legitimationsstrategien und Selbstvergewisserung der Hohenzollern während des 15. Jahrhunderts', pp. 175–94) provides an interesting parallel to O. Auge's reflections, demonstrating — on the basis of Frederick II of Brandenburg's 1464 instructions for counsellor Hertnid von Stein, who was to use them in negotiations with the emperor — how the Hohenzollerns justified their claims to Szczecin Pomerania and how they defended themselves against the accusations of only recently rising to the rank of Princes of the Holy Roman Empire, accusations levelled by representatives of the Pomeranian dynasty. André Thieme ('Die inszenierte Dynastie und ihr Held. Zur fürstlichen Identität der Wettiner im späten Mittelalter', pp. 195–223) presents attempts by the House of Wettin, split into smaller branches, to create their

own history, with a substantial role being played in the process by the memory of Frederick's victorious battle against King Albert at Lucka in 1307. Ending this group, in his paper ('Strategien der Herrschaftslegitimation am unteren Rand des Fürstenstandes: Das Beispiel der Markgrafen von Baden', pp. 225–45) Heinz Krieg presents a family that rose to the rank of Princes of the Holy Roman Empire only in 1362. Before that the Margraves of Baden had described themselves in documents and on seals as Margraves of Verona, and stressed their fidelity to the House of Staufens in Italy. Towards the end of the thirteenth century they dropped all references to Verona from their titles, which denoted a considerable lowering of their rank. The Margraves of Baden were able to make up for their losses in this respect only in the fifteenth century, when they became linked to the Habsburgs by marriage.

The last group of papers, devoted to Poland, opens with a paper by Wojciech Mrozowicz ('Die Polnische Chronik (Polnisch-Schlesische Chronik) und die Chronik der Fürsten Polens (Chronica principum Poloniae) als Mittel zur dynastischen Identitätsstiftung der schlesischen Piasten', pp. 249–62), whose starting premise is that the political ambitions of the Silesian Piasts were limited almost exclusively to Poland and to accession to the throne in Cracow. These ambitions were hindered by, among others, the fact that the Silesian Piasts were commonly regarded by the other members of the family as traitors to their homeland. To improve their reputation and justify their national ambitions, the Silesian Piasts used historiographic works like the *Chronicon Polono-Silesiacum* from the late thirteenth century and *Chronica principum Poloniae* written one hundred years later. Piotr Rabiej ('Die Legitimierung der Herrschaft Bolesławs des Schamhaften, Herzog von Krakau und Sandomierz, im Lichte seiner Urkunden', pp. 263–76) describes the techniques found in Boleslaus the Chaste's documents and used to legitimize his rule before and after coming of age — in 1234–43 he used the title of Duke of Sandomierz, and then, consistently, Duke of Cracow and Sandomierz. Wojciech Drelicharz ('Dux Cracoviae oder künftiger rex Poloniae? Die Legitimation von monarchischer Herrschaft in der Krakauer Geschichtsschreibung des 13.–14. Jahrhunderts', pp. 277–303) draws in his analysis on the annals and chronicles that referred to the *vitæ* of St Stanislaus by Wincenty of Kielcza. The authors of these works expressed their hope that entire Poland would one day be ruled by Boleslaus the Chaste. A parallel was provided by the *Chronicon Polono-Silesiacum*, with its emphasis on Poland's dependence on the empire, and the *vitæ* of St Adalbert, presenting Poland's independence from the empire from 1000. However, these ideas were not continued. On the other hand, in the early fourteenth century authors of later annals and Dzierzwa saw only the Cuyavian line of Piasts as entitled to rule whole Poland, especially when it came to Ladislaus the Elbow-High, who was even perceived as a personification of King David. In her paper ('Ego, qui principis ordine dego. Das Problem der fürstlichen Titulatur der Breslauer Bischöfe im 14.–15. Jahrhundert', pp. 305–18) Ewa Wólkiewicz wonders whether Heinrich von Würben, Bishop of Wrocław, really had the

right to use the title of prince in his document. Given the relations in Germany, she concludes that this was by no means a case of usurpation, because the bishop did indeed have the right to use the title and, moreover, the title was not an expression of any claim to rule a specific territory. In the last paper in this group ('Die Legitimierung der Herrschaft in Masowien im Lichte der Urkunden und Korrespondenz der masowischen Herzogin Anna Radziwiłłówna', pp. 319–48) its authors, Marta Piber-Zbieranowska and Anna Supruniuk, examine all acts of power by Anna Radziwiłł after the death of her husband Conrad III the Red in 1503. No historiographic evidence or works legitimizing her rule have been found for the period until she yielded power to her sons in 1518 — instead, we have Duchess Anna's various foundations (for example expansion of her residence in Warsaw and attempts to make Warsaw the seat of a bishopric).

As G. Vercamer notes in the conclusion, dynasties regarded as rightful stressed the legitimacy of their rule generally through its long continuation. However, there were also other strategies employed for the purpose, for example, stressing the ancient origins of the ruling family, services to the current monarch, right to refuse obedience despite basic loyalty to the God-anointed king or emperor as well as a particularly fine victory on the battlefield, which was associated with one member of the family being hailed as its hero.

Jarosław Sochacki
(*Słupsk*)
(Translated by Anna Kijak)

Patronat artystyczny Jagiellonów, ed. Marek Walczak and Piotr Węcowski, Cracow: Societas Vistulana, 2015, 420 pp., *Studia Jagiellonica*, vol. 1

The series *Studia Jagiellonica* debuts with a volume of collected essays on artistic patronage. Continuing rich scholarship on the Jagiellonian reign in Poland and focusing on artistic commissions of individual Jagiellons, the essays discuss the provenance, production, and function of works of art and architecture. The volume's title provides a conceptual umbrella for a variety of inquiries dedicated to both individual objects and their groups. The editors and contributors have treated the meanings of Jagiellonians and patronage as implicit; hence, readers should come with and rely upon their own understanding of who Jagiellonians were and the meaning of patronage. The Jagiellonians appear to include kings of Poland and some of their spouses — queens Anna of Cilli, Sophia of Halshany, Elisabeth of Austria, Bona Sforza and her daughter Anna Jagiellon. Few essays regard patronage as a process, the majority focus on the result — objects of art and architecture that survived or can be traced to this day even if indirectly. The understanding that Jagiellonians and patronage are self-evident notions positions the book within the realm of objects, rather than the social

history of art which inquires into a patron's means, motives, activities, and ties with masters. The three parts of the volume titled after function and medium — 'Representation of Royal Majesty', 'Architecture', and 'Painting, Sculpture, and Fine Crafts' — confirm that the essays are about things rather than people and their roles in supporting artistic production.

The regrettable omission of a conceptual link does not diminish the scholarly value of the essays, written in the Polish language and aimed at a Polish speaking audience, to whom the Jagiellonian reigns and their events are common historical knowledge. Since the essay topics offer the variables rather than constants of Jagiellonian relations to the arts, I shall look at each contribution through the lens of the Jagiellonian impact on the provenances and functions of the objects in question.

The volume opens with Marek Walczak's overview of scholarly input into the research on the multifaceted connections of individual Jagiellons to the arts, and an introduction to the essays. Extensive bibliographical references provided in the overview will be appreciated by any scholar working on courtly arts and high material culture. The first essay by Przemysław Mrozowski on kings' images within the system of royal representations considers effigies and portraits cast in various mediums, and inquires into their commission, circulation and function beyond that of simply depicting a personage. According to the author, the pattern of royal representation in Poland was set by Casimir the Great and adopted by the Jagiellonians, who supplemented it with elements particular to their time. The discussion of marital portraits, known mostly only from written evidence, includes princesses, but leaves out queens, who, strictly speaking, were not Jagiellonians by birth. The section on the altered likenesses of Sigismund the Old in two subsequent editions of the *Statutes* (1524) suggests courtly interference in representing and circulating the image of the reigning king. The overview of Jagiellonian portraiture from late fourteenth to nearly the end of the sixteenth century concludes that these depictions emphasized human nature, rather than the royal office of the sitters, thus attesting to Jagiellonian modesty in visual representations.

Mateusz Grzęda investigates other effigies, among which the decorative heads affixed to the ceiling of the Envoys' Hall in the Wawel residence are given most attention. The puzzle of the origin and function of these decorations is resolved along the lines of contemporaneous theories and fashions of astrology and physiognomy. Grzęda relates the heads to the personifications envisaged in the popular treatises of the *Table of Cebes* and *Children of the Planets*. This sound inscription of sculpted heads into the knowledge and fashion of the time could be enriched by exploring the stated link to the personality of Sigismund I, the intellectual atmosphere of his court and the University's contribution towards it.

The subject of heads is taken on by Anna Wszyńska, who focuses on the head of Sigismund I by investigating his caps. Based on an axiomatic view of importance of costume in manifesting social status, the author concentrates on headgear

represented in the king's portraits and looks for analogies and precedents in Western European portraiture. The so-called golden bonnet (*Goldhaube*), the cap dominating in the portraits of King Sigismund I, is considered an imitation of and reference to the king's appearance when it is found worn by noblemen.

The symbolic and quotidian aspect of cloth is the topic of Helena Hryszko's inquiry into the funeral robes of Queen Sophia. Based on Leonard Lep-szy's descriptions made at the opening of the queen's coffin in 1902 and data from the 2001–03 conservation of textile samples preserved in the Chapter's treasury, Hryszko confirms a contemporary Italian provenance of the material for the queen's coat, speculates upon Oriental origins for the Damask silk which covered coffin interior, and suggests that the queen was laid in state wearing a taffeta dress, whose changing colours were visually enriched with seven gilded buttons. Regrettably, this meticulous analysis of textiles offers little evidence on the queen's patronage or tastes.

The article by Krzysztof J. Czyżewski on Jagiellonian endowments to Cracow's Cathedral concludes the first part of the volume. Any researcher concerned with late medieval goldsmiths will benefit a lot from the list of precious objects, those surviving and also those known only from written records. The appearances of the latter have been carefully reconstructed in writing. Jagiellonian donations are neatly related to specific occasions, thus informing about devotional appeals and the commemorative practices of individual family members. Although much more concerned with objects than donors, the essay reveals highly uneven relations between the Jagiellons and the Cathedral, or at least such a reflection is derived from available material. Within the context of the volume, the article stands out for emphasizing notable female donors, such as queens Sophia of Halshany, Elisabeth of Austria and Anna Jagiellon. This contribution also mentions Cardinal Frederick, whose overlapping ecclesiastical and royal identities resulted in numerous bequests. Exceptionally rich and abundant donations and foundations by prince and King Sigismund I stand in sharp contrast to a sole bequest made by his son Sigismund II Augustus. The article conveys the fluctuating understanding of 'good and pious deeds' as instrumental in salvation. Royal office bound the Jagiellonians to the Cathedral and shaped their relations with it; however, the research denies the existence of a consistent Jagiellonian pattern in strengthening and maintaining these ties.

The article by Piotr Pajor on the apse of the Corpus Christi Church in Poznań opens the section dedicated to architecture. Founded by Ladislaus (II) Jagello in 1406 on the site where glowing Host was found in 1399, the church stands out for its demonstration of the king's devotion to the Eucharist. A recently discovered corbel stone bearing the arms of Queen Hedwig (Jadwiga) of Anjou suggests heraldic symbolism in the church established in memory of King Ladislaus II and his first two wives. Architecture atypical of Greater Poland relates the church to Cracovian examples; however, the impact of its founder on the building's appearance remains obscure.

Moving to the topic of Jagiellonian residences, Tomasz Olszacki provides a review of available source information on the construction, repair, and usage of the no longer extant castle in Nowy Korczyn. King Ladislaus II's expenditure from the decade between 1388 and 1398 and in the years 1406–08 sheds light on the building works, while an inventory from 1585 informs on room functions and furnishings. However, the place of the castle within Jagiellonian patronage requires more elaborate clarification.

The three essays on Jagiellonian reconstructions of the Wawel residence start with Marcin Fabiański's inquiry into the motives for undertaking such extensive building works. According to the author, the reconstruction of the castle was prompted by the fire of 1500, and the need to make the scattered buildings serve the king and the kingdom functionally and visually. The building activities initiated by Alexander before his coronation in 1502 were continued by his brother and successor Sigismund I. The symbolism of the construction works is interpreted along the lines of authors from Antiquity and their Humanist readings, especially the treatise by Stanisław Zborowski, courtier from 1498 and guardian of the royal treasure from 1513, titled 'Call to Arms against Infidels'. The largely overlooked woodcut portrait of Sigismund the Old printed in the *Chronicle* of Marcin Bielski in 1554 is placed within the context of portraits of founders with their buildings in the background. Fabiański suggests that the woodcut was made after a lost painted portrait of Sigismund I, which presented and perpetuated the tradition of the king as the builder of the residence. Alternatively, Bartolomeo Berrecci's signature in the lantern of the Sigismund Chapel of the Cracow Cathedral is seen as a sign of the founder's modesty, understood following narrative prescriptions of the great deeds of rulers of Antiquity.

Tomasz Ratajczak focuses on the functional arrangement of the Wawel residence. Beginning with Alexander, the Jagiellonian rulers continued adapting the palace to the needs of the court and the state. The author looks for the functions of and connections between rooms and halls, and establishes how the state institutions and courts of reigning King Sigismund I, the junior King Sigismund II Augustus, and the royal ladies, functioned within the palace's architecture. Information about various premises in the residence comes largely from occasional texts produced for weddings, receptions and funerals, during which the rooms' functions were transformed. The essay's particular value lies in the attempt at finding evidence for quotidian use of the chambers by searching for hints scattered through account books and other circumstantial sources. As to a specifically Jagiellonian arrangement, the author highlights the existence of the court of Sigismund II Augustus, whose position of junior king required restructuring within architecture as well as courtly routines.

Tomasz Torbus sets out to discuss patronage *par excellence* and informs on the activities of five architects involved in reconstruction of the palace. A change of master builders supports the thesis of stylistic hybridity in the architecture of the Wawel residence. Regrettably, the essay being a seriously abridged version of

the author's book on the same topic does not reveal the role of these architects as royal clients and the Jagiellonian motives for commissioning them. Agnieszka Januszek-Sieradzka investigates the expenditure of Sigismund II Augustus for the building works in Cracow and Niepołomice in the years 1549–51. The article argues that the recently inaugurated king spared no resources to provide utmost comfort for his wife Barbara Radziwiłł and to make the prestige of royal couple visually manifest.

The third part of the volume dedicated to painting, sculpture and fine crafts begins with the study by Małgorzata Smorań-Różycka on the heraldic frieze recently discovered in the apse of the Cathedral of Sandomierz. The arms of Queen Anna of Cilli, second wife of King Ladislaus II, allow dating of the Byzantine wall paintings in the church to the decade between 1402/03 and 1413. Considering how the frieze might have functioned within the church interior, the author suggests the location of royal seats under the six-meter-long row of personal and territorial coats of arms.

The Byzantine murals in the Holy Trinity Chapel in Lublin Castle are addressed by Marek Walczak in his essay on the equestrian image of King Ladislaus II. Having placed it alongside extensive comparative material, the author relates this representation as a triumphal, heavenly intercession on behalf of the king and his kingdom (especially, the victory in the Battle of Grunwald) and imagines the royal seat in the chapel as being associated with the king's painted effigy.

Marek A. Janicki attempts to elucidate the dating and provenance of Ladislaus II's tombstone in Cracow Cathedral. Having reviewed abundant scholarship on the topic and inquired meticulously into the meaning and usage of specific words in texts of fifteenth and eighteenth centuries, the essay concludes that the upper plaque of the tomb with king's effigy was sculpted between 1421 and 1430, the year when it was first recorded to be kept in Collegium Maius. The side panels are of later date and were fixed together before the king's funeral. As to artistic provenance, it is suggested that the no longer extant tomb of Louis of Anjou in Szeged, which King Ladislaus II might have seen in 1412, inspired the commissioner's choice of red Hungarian marble and the representation of the lying figure.

Arranged chronologically, the essays proceed towards the reign of Casimir Jagiellon and commissions of his mother Queen Sophia. Magdalena Łanuszka looks into the artistic context of the altarpiece of Our Lady of Sorrows. Having reviewed earlier research on the topic, the author continues searching for iconographic and stylistic sources and antecedents for the painted wings of the triptych. Among other issues she suggests that these pieces follow lost work by Rogier van der Weyden, and asks how the royal couple chose the painter. The conclusion insists that it was not the Netherlandish style — an exceptional feature of this altarpiece among contemporaneous paintings of Lesser Poland — but the reputation and popularity of a local Cracovian, alas anonymous, painter, which determined the choice.

Dobrosława Horzela discusses the two retables of the Jagiellonian commission preserved in the Chapel of the Holy Cross of the Cracow Cathedral. Placing the two pieces within the context of courtly art, the author argues for the stylistic and iconographic retrospectivism of the triptych of Our Lady of Sorrows emphasizing visual continuity with the Holy Trinity altarpiece made for the funeral chapel of Queen Sophia. Horzela suggests that the latter was carved with Viennese prototypes in mind and argues that in Cracow objects from Vienna have been regarded as manifestations of imperial might. Regrettably, the essay does not provide more information about Queen Sophia's knowledge of the Vienna court and its impact on the queen, whose choice determined the altarpiece's iconography if not its appearance. The importance of the latter is revealed by the fact that the paraments commissioned by the queen for the chapel were made to correspond iconographically and perhaps visually with the altarpiece. The article concludes that court art is above all formed by the available resources; however, these are understood as material rather than human.

Magdalena Piwocka interprets the collection of Sigismund II Augustus' tapestries as a means to express royal prestige. Looking at their artistic provenance the scholar emphasizes the uniqueness of this commission regarding their content and number. Although agents of the Brussels workshops sought buyers for predesigned tapestries, Sigismund Augustus commissioned an original cycle of the Genesis, as documents from 1547 and investigation of the tapestries testify. Later the collection was supplemented with tapestries woven to fit the interiors of Wawel castle. The article praises the originality of the commission: the tapestries were copied numerous times, but themselves copied none. Such praise echoes the Renaissance model of a connoisseur collector-patron, although motives of originality and novelty more readily resonate with modernist values.

The volume concludes with the essay by Tanita Ciesielska concerning the silver altar retable made for the Sigismund Chapel of Cracow Cathedral. Based on the investigation performed during the restoration of the piece in 2002, the author informs on complex techniques employed in the retable's production, refuting Johannes Neudörfer's information from 1542 which states that the piece was made by stamping. Importantly for the volume dedicated to artistic patronage, the author reconstructs the process of production, indicating its phases and logistics: the design, carving wooden relief for king's approval, making a copper sample again approved by the king, and the final production of a silver retable, which was taken to Cracow in 1535. This research clarifies that the Nativity scene in the epitaph of Joseph Feuerabend in the Church of St Gumbert in Ansbach was made in 1545, after the wooden relief which remained in Nuremberg after Sigismund's commission was executed and delivered to Cracow.

What are common denominators of Jagiellonian relationship to the arts? Is it possible to tackle general patterns of Jagiellonian patronage by focusing on particular cases? What is the Jagiellonian profile as patrons and how they were involved in the art scene of the time? Did they regard patronage as an attribute

of 'great men', political virtue and cultural prestige? These questions remain to be answered in further volumes of *Studia Jagiellonica*, which has begun with articles so richly varied and elegantly produced, and might also consider affirming or denying a continued cultural agenda of the extensive Jagiellonian family.

Giedrė Mickūnaitė
(Vilnius)

(Proofreading by Yelizaveta Crofts)

Mikołaj Szołtysek, *Rethinking East-Central Europe: Family Systems and Co-residence in The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth*, 2 vols, Bern: Peter Lang, 2015, vol. 1: *Contexts and Analyses*, vol. 2: *Data Quality Assessments, Documentation, and Bibliography*, 1062 pp.

Nearly half a century ago, thanks to English historians gathered around Peter Laslett in the Cambridge Group, there emerged in world historiography a new trend devoted to studies of family and household forms based on nominative censuses. Initially, this was about getting to know the process of household formation, the internal structure of households as well as their size in Europe and other parts of the world.¹ Some time later, without abandoning the discussion and the disputes over the European model of marriage proposed by John Hajnal and the family models proposed by Laslett,² scholars began to pay more attention to exploring the family life-cycle (life-cycle approach) and the life-cycle of the individual (life-course approach),³ models of kinship and mechanisms of inheritance,⁴ not to mention the whole tangled web of their environmental, socio-economic and demographic determinants. Research conducted in recent years seems to be characterized by an even more extensive application, in the studies of the geography of family forms and cohabitation models, of new methodologies, like the microsimulation demographic models.⁵ For

¹ The beginning of the process was marked by two publications — *Household and Family in Past Time*, ed. Peter Laslett and Richard Wall, Cambridge, 1972; *Family Forms in Historic Europe*, ed. Richard Wall, Jean Robin and Peter Laslett, Cambridge, 1983.

² Cf. John Hajnal, 'Two Kinds of Pre-Industrial Household Formation System', in *Family Forms*, pp. 65–104; Peter Laslett, 'Family and Household as Work Group and Kin Group: Areas of Traditional Europe Compared', in *Family Forms*, pp. 513–63.

³ For example Tamara K. Hareven, *Transitions. The Family and the Life Course in Historical Perspective*, New York, 1978; Reinhard Sieder, Michael Mitterauer, 'The Reconstruction of the Family Life Course: Theoretical Problems and Empirical Results', in *Family Forms*, pp. 309–45.

⁴ See Gérard Delille, *Famille et propriété dans le royaume de Naples (XV^e-XIX^e siècle)*, Paris, 1985; Andrejs Plakans, *Kinship in the Past. An Anthropology of European Family Life 1500-1900*, Oxford, 1986; David Warren Sabean, *Kinship in Neckarhausen, 1700-1870*, Cambridge, 1998.

⁵ For more on the topic, see Zhongwei Zhao, 'Computer Microsimulation and Historical Study of Social Structure: A Comparative Review of SOCISM and CAMSIM', *Revis-*

a long time Polish historians were barely visible within this research trend,⁶ and it was not until the late twentieth century that more substantial studies by Michał Kopczyński and Cezary Kukło were published, studies devoted to the structure and size of peasant and burgher households in old Poland.⁷ All in all, our knowledge of family forms in pre-industrial Poland was not very extensive. On the other hand in Western studies, owing to a lack of more extensive research, the Polish lands were usually included in the sphere of influence of the Eastern European family model.

That is why Mikołaj Szołtysek's study devoted to the formation of the peasant family and the structure of its household in the late eighteenth century should be welcomed. With its considerable length and territorial extensiveness of its source base, use of modern research methods and theories as well as the author's excellent knowledge of world and Polish literature on the subject, the book is a very successful contribution to the international discussion about the transformations in marital and family life, and its determinants in pre-industrial societies of the old continent. The vastness of the author's research horizons influenced his work, first in Cambridge and then in German M. Planck research centres (Rostock, Halle), where he found himself after obtaining his doctorate from the University of Wrocław in 2003. It should also be added that on the basis of the study under review M. Szołtysek received his post-doctoral (*habilitation*) degree from the Martin Luther University in Halle in 2015.

The book consists of three clearly distinct parts. The first (pp. 41–256) explores the positions of various international research trends and schools (including the oeuvres of Polish, Lithuanian and Belarusian historians) which have made their mark on the previous analyses of family forms on the old continent. In addition, the author discusses in it the principles, content and structure of the CEURFAMFORM source database and presents a concise analysis of socio-economic and cultural transformations taking place in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the seventeenth–eighteenth centuries. In the second, longest part the author presents the results of his numerous analyses (pp. 269–769), while part three is devoted to the verification of the value of the sources used by the author and included in volume two (pp. 803–927). What constitutes an integral part of Szołtysek's two-volume study are often very detailed statistical

ta de Demografia Historica, 24, 2006, 2, pp. 59–88. See also Mikołaj Szołtysek, 'Komputerowa mikrosymulacja sieci krewniczkiej a wzorce współmieszkania: rzecz o demograficznych uwarunkowaniach rodziny chłopskiej w okresie staropolskim', *Przeszłość Demograficzna Polski*, 37, 2015, 1, pp. 107–61.

⁶ The collection *Family Forms* includes Jacek Kochanowicz's paper, 'The Peasant Family as an Economic Unit in the Polish Feudal Economy of the Eighteenth Century'.

⁷ Michał Kopczyński, *Studia nad rodziną chłopską w Koronie w XVII-XVIII wieku*, Warsaw, 1998 (4022 households from 1662 and 1410 households from 1791–92); Cezary Kukło, *Kobieta samotna w społeczeństwie miejskim u schyłku Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej. Studium demograficzno-społeczne*, Białystok, 1998 (5281 households in big cities and 672 in small towns from 1791–92).

tables — 83, graphs — 130 and maps — 7, featuring a variety of indicators. This huge statistical apparatus is impressive, but, it has to be said, does not facilitate reading, as is the case of the so-called Chicago-style footnotes, included in the main body of the text and sometimes taking up three, four lines.

The source base of Szoltysek's book comprises the surviving nominative listings for the Polish lands from the late eighteenth century, increasingly known with regard to their value to scholars, both those commissioned by the Civilian-Military Commission (1791–92) and those compiled for the purpose of the fifth Russian Revision, as well as the Church's *Libri status animarum* and *Seleen Register* known from German-speaking areas. Their exploration has enabled the author to create, with the help of his associates, the biggest computerized database for this part of the continent, a database with information about 26,654 peasant households from Silesia, Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine. In total, it comprises 234 parishes, with over 900 settlements and a total population of nearly 156,000 (p. 125).⁸

Worthy of note is the fact that in studying the models of family life organization in the Polish-Lithuanian state the author was particularly interested in differences in the composition of residential communities, intergenerational relations or family strategies approached in geographical terms. One of his research objectives was to test the relevancy of John Hajnal's famous line, drawn over half a century ago, running through our country and dividing Europe into models of population reproduction: western, with a predominance of nuclear families, and eastern, with a large share of complex families. Hence his right decision to group the collected data into twelve territories (Warmia, Greater Poland, Kuyavia, Ostrzeszów County, Wieluń County, Lesser Poland, Silesia, Chełm Land, Podolia, Zhytomir County, Central Belarus and Polesya), with the first seven located west of Hajnal's line and five east of it. Next they were combined by means of eight demographic variables into four larger territorial units referred to as regions (WEST — regions 1–7, EAST 1 — Chełm, Zhytomir, EAST 2 — Podolia, EAST 3 — Central Belarus and Polesya). Significantly, in his studies of co-residence of peasants towards the end of the feudal period in the Polish-Lithuanian state Szoltysek often used the CAMSIM (Cambridge Simulation) computer microsimulation developed in the 1980s. The combination of analyses of census microdata and microsimulations has made it possible, for example, to provide an estimate of the number of actually co-residing ancestors or a more precise description of the fulfilment of cultural expectations concerning the housing situation of various subpopulations in Poland and Lithuania.

The author begins his basic analyses from a broad demographic description of servants as a group in the analysed households, bearing in mind Hajnal's opinion that in Central Europe this group was apparently a sporadic component of households. Yet Szoltysek's research has revealed a considerable number of workers in peasant households in Poland and in Lithuania, although the

⁸ Gentry households are outside the author's research interest.

scale of the phenomenon, as the author stresses, differed strongly in territorial terms. The servants were much more numerous in western Poland (13.1% of the population) than in Belarus, especially Polessya (just 0.3% of the population). We find farmhands or maids in more than one-third of the households in Poland (39.3% of the total number of households), much less frequently in the Chełm Land and Zhytomir County (9.0%) and only exceptionally in Polessya (1.7%). The servant group, clearly dominated by men and clearly defeminised in eastern regions,⁹ was made up of young people for whom service was usually a transition period in their lives, as most of them were below the average age at first marriage.¹⁰

Next the author discusses the most important event in his protagonists' life, namely marriage, focusing mainly on its two aspects: age at which they married and number of people who never married. In this he uses a whole range of methods to measure the phenomenon: mean and modal age at marriage, proportion between married and unmarried individuals aged 20–24, percentage of definitely celibate individuals aged 45–54 as well as two measures made popular in the European Fertility Project headed by Ansley J. Coale, namely index of nuptiality (*Im*) and index of married women (*Im**) (pp. 409–11). Szołtysek is in no doubt that, irrespective of gender, regional nuptiality patterns in Poland varied greatly, not only in terms of the mean age at marriage (higher in the west and lower in the east) but also in terms of the initial and final stages of the process (he distinguishes three marriage systems in Poland-Lithuania, p. 428). Yet he notes that the mean age at first marriage in Polessya appears to be one of the lowest if not the lowest in Europe (p. 429). Thus rural communities in Poland and in Lithuania practically did not experience the definite bachelorhood and spinsterhood phenomenon, for those who were definitely celibate made up no more than 4% of the male population and about 5% of the women in the west, and less than 1% in eastern regions.

What should be noted in Szołtysek's analyses is his reflection on the process of taking charge of the household (pp. 493–583), because, like many Western scholars, he regards it as the basic decision-making unit, not only with regard to housing, consumption or social security, but also — as I would like to stress — to most phenomena studied from the demographic perspective. Entering headship among peasants in the western regions of the Polish-Lithuanian state was more rapid than in the east, but time spent as head of household was relatively short. On the other hand, the status of head of household was attained later in the east, but was more common and lifelong. It could be said,

⁹ According to the author, the predominance of male servants in the East may have been associated with highly patriarchal features of family organization in the region as well as various aspects of the local mentality, including the notion of female honour and greater emphasis on the protection of female virginity before marriage, as a result of which female service in these areas was seen as a humiliating or even disgraceful experience (p. 359).

¹⁰ In western Poland only 6% of maids and 10% of farmhands were over 30.

following the author, that there was no such thing as retirement in Poland's rural communities in the east (p. 511). To a large extent the same differences could be observed among women.

Szołtysek's research has highlighted — significantly, in a broad geographical spectrum — the relatively small size of eighteenth-century peasant households, smaller in the west, 5.31 people on average (5.99 dwellers/house) and only slightly bigger in the east, especially in Polessya — 6.43 people (6.52 dwellers/house). Thus his findings do not confirm the existence in Poland-Lithuania of residential groups resembling the great Slavic *zadruga* or Russian *dvors*. On this basis he advocates the use, in further population estimates in Poland and Lithuania, of a model ratio of six persons to one rural hearth (p. 605). Although the average sizes of peasant households did not differ much territorially, yet, as Szołtysek points out and what is worthy of note, their internal structure was quite different. In western Poland (with slight exceptions) the household corresponded to the total domination of residential groups with just one nuclear family. Only 15% of households in the region were made up of two related families living under the same roof, while cohabiting groups of relatives made up of more than two nuclear families were a rarity in the west (less than 1%). In the eastern regions of the Polish-Lithuanian state, on the other hand, the complexity of household rises drastically, although the south-eastern borderlands cannot be regarded as a uniform territory in this respect. Generally, we see here more households consisting of two families and sometimes accounting for as much as over one-third of the total. However, in Polessya, for example, over 60% of all households were made up of two or more nuclear families.¹¹ Therefore, we cannot say that there was a tendency in the eastern regions, so marked in western Poland, to share the living space only with the most immediate and few more distant relatives.

Later on in the book the author draws the reader's attention to analyses of regional differences in the structure of complex domestic, polynuclear groups, including analyses of cohabitation of relatives. The contrast between the western and the eastern part of the Polish-Lithuanian state was evident. In Polessya the share of co-resident groups of relatives was particularly high, as they represented as many as one-third of the population. This growth, as Szołtysek's research demonstrates, was caused by a sharp rise in the four categories of co-resident relatives of the head of the household: siblings, sons and sons-in-law, nephews/nieces and grandchildren. As the author adds, among the relatives in all regions of Poland-Lithuania women were more numerous (about 70 men per 100 women).

Detailed analyses of marital and family circumstances of co-resident relatives to be found in Szołtysek's study have revealed a huge variety of possible combinations as well as their intensity. Nevertheless, they appear to be struc-

¹¹ Every sixth household in the region comprised as many as three related families (p. 606).

tured regionally, which, according to the author, would suggest that there were significant differences in the organization of co-resident kin in various parts of the pre-partition Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (p. 639).

The findings presented in Szoltysek's latest book are far broader than those only briefly outlined in this review. Generally, the book reveals that towards the end of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth there were at least three different family models (p. 772), although the author is more inclined to suggest a unique Polish-Lithuanian family model, i.e. a model that is neither Russian nor German, but that can be common to several other societies in Central and Eastern Europe. Significantly, the research discussed here has also revealed a strong correspondence between the religious east-west division and the family organization in the Polish-Lithuanian state, for in regions dominated by the Greek Catholic Church domestic groups and their situation were much more complex than in predominantly Catholic regions, although the author rightly points out that further research and interpretation are needed here.

As we read any book with such broad research objectives, we have, of course, quite a lot of questions and doubts (over for example not very precise source terminology concerning some household members that may distort the image of the family structure, or not very precise recording of kinship ties). However, they stem, as I have already mentioned, primarily from the extensive nature of the source base and its varied scholarly value, which in turn creates various possibilities of reconstruction and interpretation. What may be the most serious shortcoming of Szoltysek's valuable analyses is the virtual elimination from these analyses of the impact of the socio-economic structure of the Polish-Lithuanian peasantry. There is no great need to argue that, especially in the late feudal period, the formation of the family, its duration as well as size of its household differed markedly depending on the social and professional status of the family members. Parts of the book that are important but also debatable are those in which the author tries to explain the differences in the marriage formation patterns in the western and eastern regions of the Polish-Lithuanian state (pp. 458-84). The most important thing, however, is the fact that Szoltysek's monograph represents modern scholarship, still — as I would like to stress — underrepresented in Polish historiography; it provides a very competent introduction to the whole material and the subject matter in question. On the other hand the author formulates his final conclusions — from the perspective of the legitimacy of the concept of the historical region called 'Central and Eastern Europe' — in a rather cautious manner, encouraging further research into the areas between Germany and Russia, as well as further discussion.

Szoltysek's study is not only successful but also very needed, both by Polish and, perhaps even more so, foreign scholars, who often are inclined — drawing on very modest foundations — to infer *a priori* conclusions concerning differences in the social development of people living in pre-partition Poland. The book under review is a serious step forward in research into old Polish family

forms and residence patterns against a European background,¹² for it brings a lot of substantively and methodologically important observations, and considerably expands our current knowledge of the structures of peasant families and their households. Let us hope that it will be followed by more Polish studies using this type of archive material on such a scale for other social groups and for other periods.

Cezary Kuklo
(Białystok)
(Translated by Anna Kijak)

Daniel Brewing, *Im Schatten von Auschwitz. Deutsche Massaker an polnischen Zivilisten 1939–1945*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2016, 363 pp., Veröffentlichungen der Forschungsstelle Ludwigsburg der Universität Stuttgart, vol. 29, edited by Martin Cüppers and Klaus-Michael Mallmann

It is usually the *Kwartalnik Historyczny*'s editorial board that gives a copy of a book to someone to write a review of it. This time it was different. Having found Daniel Brewing's work praised in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*,¹ I asked the journal's editors to assign it to me, to inform the Polish reader of what I consider to be a clear accomplishment of German historiography. Presenting the book seemed all the more justified once I read it and realized that it was inspired by Richard C. Lukas's *The Forgotten Holocaust. The Poles under German Occupation 1939–1944*, published thirty years ago in the USA.² The titles of both works *Im Schatten von Auschwitz* and *The Forgotten Holocaust* indicate that the authors' interest lay not in the extermination of the Jewish population but in the lesser-known ordeal of the Poles, not covered by the Nuremberg Laws.

Brewing is well-equipped to carry out his scholarly undertaking. In the years 2008–09 he completed a fellowship at the German Historical Institute operating for years in Warsaw. Having mastered the language, he was able to be-

¹² When it comes to family organization on the old continent, Szoltysek firmly rejects the diving line proposed by Hajnal, Mitterauer and others, and running across the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, from the north-east to the south-west. Instead, he draws the line completely differently, that is from the north-west to the south-east (p. 783).

¹ Holger Thünemann, 'Von Warschau nach Westerland. Deutsche Massaker an polnischen Zivilisten während des Zweiten Weltkrieges', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 13 December 2016.

² Richard C. Lukas, *The Forgotten Holocaust. The Poles under German Occupation 1939–1944*, Lexington, 1986. Brewing admits that this book's author deserves credit for being the first to provide the western audience with an account of Polish suffering (p. 29). The Polish edition: Richard C. Lukas, *Zapomniany holokaust*.

come acquainted with Polish archive materials and Polish academic literature and to establish contacts with Polish scholars specializing in the history of the Second World War and German occupation. In addition to his research in Poland, he also had the opportunity to work at the Holocaust Memorial Museum and the Paris Fondation pour la Mémoire de la Shoah.

Im Schatten von Auschwitz is a published version of the dissertation he defended at the University of Stuttgart in 2014. The work was written under the supervision of the distinguished scholar Klaus-Michael Mallmann, with a particular competence in this field. Brewing had made his scholarly debut with a work published three years earlier in Polish. He works now at the Technische Hochschule in Aachen.

With regard to the primary sources on which the work is based, I would like to emphasize especially the Polish source materials, of which the author has made thorough use, and records by the occupation authorities and of the post-war trials of war criminals, held in German archives. The multilingual bibliography and the author's command of Polish literature are impressive.

Concerned predominantly with the years 1939–45, the most tragic chapter in the history of Polish-German relations, Brewing's work also covers an earlier period, and rightly so. In my opinion he is right to contend that in terms of growing enmity between the two nations a turning point came in 1848.³ As a student of national stereotypes, I consider the information pertaining to the image of 'the Pole' created by the Germans to be particularly valuable. It reflects not only this enmity, but also a disdain and sense of cultural superiority with which the Poles were perceived in Germany. Most Polish readers may be unfamiliar, with an excellent book by Vejas Gabriel Liulevicius *Kriegsland im Osten. Eroberung, Kolonisierung und Militärherrschaft im Ersten Weltkrieg* (Hamburg, 2002), which Brewing uses to cite German soldiers' opinions about the Poles and Poland (p. 49). Thus, we learn what the future General Heinz Guderian wrote to his wife in a letter dated 24 May 1919. He first called the Poles barbarians and then enumerated their national 'traits'. The Poles, referred to in the letter as paupers, scruffs and fools, were in his opinion untalented, immoral and insidious (p. 58). The scorn which the Germans held for their eastern neighbours, 'a nation that needs a whip above its head to feel well and safe', can also be found in Claus von Stauffenberg's letters to his wife from the September of 1939.⁴

According to Germans of the time, it was insidiousness that especially typified the Poles, constituting the most distinctive trait of the Polish national character. The word *heimtückisch* that appears in Guderian's letter is used in

³ See Tomasz Szarota, '18–19 marca 1848 r. w Berlinie. Na tropach legendy o Polakach "fabrykantach rewolucji"', in *Losy Polaków w XIX–XX w. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Stefanowi Kieniewiczowi w osiemdziesiątą rocznicę Jego urodzin*, ed. Barbara Grochulska and Jerzy Skowronek, Warsaw, 1987, pp. 465–82.

⁴ See Peter Hoffmann, *Claus Schenk Graf von Stauffenberg und seine Brüdern*, Stuttgart, 2004, p. 189.

German along with the synonymous *hinterlistig*. It is quite typical that SS Gruppenführer and Generalleutnant Waffen SS Heinz Reinefarth used both words in referring to the Poles as a ‘cruel enemy using insidious and deceitful methods of fighting’⁵ on 5 November 1944 — one month after the suppression of the Warsaw Uprising. In his analysis of the way in which the Germans fought the Polish resistance movement, including the Polish guerrilla units, Brewing often cites German documents in which Polish partisans are referred to by the word *Heckenschützen*, that is ‘shooting from behind the bushes’ (in Polish we would say ‘from round the corner’). It may come as a surprise that the strong criticism raised a few years ago by the ZDF film *Generation War* (origin. Germ. *Unsere Mütter, unsere Väter*, dir. by Philipp Kadelbach) focused mainly on the anti-Semitism of which Polish partisans were accused, and not at all on the partisans’ involvement in attempts to ambush German soldiers, a practice likely to be viewed by the Germans as dishonourable.

The book under review consists of a comprehensive, forty-page-long preface and three parts divided into twelve chapters. In addition to discussion of primary sources and secondary literature, the preface provides a justification for using the term ‘Massaker’ which appears in the work’s subtitle. The author associates ‘massacre’ with the slaughter of defenceless animals. However he rejects the term ‘genocide’, since in his opinion all cases of mass murder of non-resistant civilians who fall victim to the principle and practice of a collective responsibility, should be considered in relation to the specific spatio-temporal circumstances in which they took place. The first part (pp. 41–128) concerns itself with analysing the process of growing enmity between the two nations, beginning with the Spring of Nations, through to the Great War and the inter-war period. Regarding the latter, the author deals with what he calls the Polish-German cooperation of the years 1934–38.⁶ His attention is also drawn to ‘horror propaganda’ and its continuation in September of 1939 and the first months of German occupation. In a form of preparation for the war, it consisted of accusing the Poles of a policy of terror against members of the German minority in Poland. This section of the work contains a fragment devoted to the ‘bloody Bydgoszcz Sunday’ (Bromberger Blutsonntag).⁷ The second part of the work is the most lengthy and the most important one. Entitled “Polnische Banden” — Krieg, Be-

⁵ The’s author’s attention was drawn to the text published in *Ostdeutscher Beobachter* by Dieter Pohl. If I am not mistaken this statement by Reinefarth has never been cited in Polish literature.

⁶ The author cites in this context the book by Karina Pryt, *Befohlene Freundschaft. Die deutsch-polnischen Kulturbeziehungen 1934–1939* (Osnabrück, 2010), but fails to refer to works by a distinguished expert on the topic Bogusław Drewniak: *Polen und Deutschland 1919–1939. Wege und Irrwege kultureller Zusammenarbeit*, Düsseldorf, 1999 and idem, *Polsko-niemieckie zблиżenia w kręgu kultury 1919–1939*, Gdańsk, 2005.

⁷ I do not understand why the author has failed to make use of a massive volume of 885 pages, *Bydgoszcz 3–4 września 1939*, ed. Tomasz Chinciński and Paweł Machcewicz, Warsaw, 2008.

satzungspolitik und die Logik der Massaker' (pp. 129–290), it provides an account of the activity of German self-defence units (Selbstschutz), armed detachments made up of members of Poland's German minority that supported the occupier's policy of terror.⁸ A separate chapter is devoted to the German operations targeting the detachment led by Major Henryk Dobrzański, alias 'Hubal' (the first Polish partisan leader, active in the years 1939–40) and the bloody repression the Germans consequently inflicted on the civilian population (pp. 173–93). Further sections of the text concern the fighting against Polish partisan troops across 1942–44 and the bloody suppression of the Warsaw Uprising, including crimes committed against the city's non-combatants.

The third part (pp. 291–326) offers a critical account of how West German society dealt with the Nazi past and the German justice system's treatment of war criminals who were West German citizens. Quite telling in this context are the several-year proceedings carried out against a perpetrator of the murder of village inhabitants from the Lublin region in the Spring of 1940. SS Hauptsturmführer Friedrich Paulus stood five trials in the West Germany. His defence attorneys alternately tried to convince the court that the defendant had acted in retaliation for crimes committed by the Poles, or called for a dismissal of charges on due to expiration of the limitation period. Paulus escaped punishment by release in 1987 (pp. 306–11).

It is not my intention to summarize this excellent book, nor would it be possible here. My goal is to signal some of the issues it raises, and to point out some of the defects it suffers. Of particular value is in my opinion the author's exposition of the role played in the German occupation apparatus by former members of the paramilitary Freikorps units, established in 1918 and involved, among other activities, in fighting Silesian insurgents. The author mentions the Higher SS and the Police Leader in General Government, Friedrich Wilhelm Krüger and Erich von dem Bach-Zelewski czy Ludolf von Alvensleben respectively. The latter is credited with the saying: 'I don't like my breakfast if I haven't killed twenty Poles stone dead first' (p. 96). To these names one can add Erich Koch and the commandant of Auschwitz concentration camp Rudolf Höss. I have already mentioned that a topic dealt with in the book are the Selbstschutz voluntary units, created in September 1939 by German citizens of Poland and supporting the German invasion. The author's strength as a researcher lies especially in his ability to thoroughly reconstruct specific events. In order to show the nature of the Selbstschutz units and the role they played in the extermination of the Polish civilian population, he begins with an account of events that took place in the village of

⁸ It is worth mentioning that interest in Selbstschutz units appeared almost simultaneously in Poland and in Germany, see Tomasz Ceran, 'Zapomniani kaci Hitlera. Volksdeutscher Selbstschutz w Polsce w 1939 r. Stan badań i potrzeby badawcze', in *Polska pod okupacją 1939-1945*, Warsaw, 2015–, vol. 1, ed. Marek Gałżowski et al., pp. 301–20, and idem, *Volksdeutscher Selbstschutz w okupowanej Polsce*, Bydgoszcz and Gdańsk, 2016.

Józefów on 13 April 1940 — a criminal assault in which German settlers, the Kassner family of five, were murdered by Poles. In subsequent retaliatory action Germans, led by Avlensleben, killed 161 innocent people from the surrounding area, despite the perpetrators of the assault having been captured by the Blue Police, a formation composed of Poles, but under German command (pp. 102–04).

I was surprised by the author's remark that the Germans used lessons learned in Poland to fight the French Resistance (p. 33).⁹ We can thank Brewing for contributing to the debate on 'Judenjagd', which has continued for several years. As Brewing reminds us, it was opened by Christopher Browning who referred to the hunt for Jews in Poland as the final phase of *Endlösung* in his 2006 article published in Germany.¹⁰ Five years later two books supporting his thesis appeared in Poland, one by Jan Grabowski and the other by Barbara Engelking.¹¹ However, while these authors blame anti-Semitism and the desire for wealth for causing Poles to join the hunt for Jews, Brewing attributes a causative role to the occupation authorities who sought to use Polish peasants to fight all forms of resistance. In his opinion, several factors stood behind this 'cooperation' with the occupier: submission to the repeated calls from the Nazi authorities, the use of coercion, rewards offered for denouncing hidden Jews and the fear of punishment for failing to follow the occupier's orders (pp. 216–24). The author also contributes to the ongoing debate on the Red Army's withholding support for the Warsaw Uprising. Following Karl-Heinz Frieser,¹² he points to Field Marshal Walter Model's counter-offensive, the defeat suffered by the Soviets in the tank battle at the River Vistula, as the main factor that determined the Red Army's conduct (p. 271). In the book's conclusion, Brewing modifies Polish scholarly findings regarding the number of civilians murdered by the Germans in actions taken against 'criminal bands'. While Waclaw Długoborski and Czesław Madajczyk estimated the number of victims at 4,000 and almost 20,000 respectively, Brewing raises it to between 35–40,000.

Concluding this review I would like to offer a few critical remarks. First of all, the author failed to make use of the work by Karol Marian Pospieszalski (1909–

⁹ The author draws here on Peter Lieb's findings presented in the article 'Repression of Eastern Front Experience on Anti-Partisan Warfare in France 1943–1944', *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, 31, 2008, 5, pp. 797–823.

¹⁰ Christopher Browning, "Judenjagd". Die Schlussphase der "Endlösung" in Polen', in *Deutsche, Juden, Völkermord*, ed. Jürgen Matthäus and Klaus-Michael Mallmann, Darmstadt, 2008, pp. 177–89.

¹¹ Jan Grabowski, *Judenjagd. Polowanie na Żydów. Studium dziejów pewnego powiatu*, Warsaw, 2011, and Barbara Engelking, *Jest taki piękny, słoneczny dzień. Losy Żydów szukających ratunku na wsi polskiej 1942–1945*, Warsaw, 2011.

¹² The author cites his text: 'Ein zweites "Wunder an der Weichsel"? Die Panzerschlacht vor Warschau im August 1944 und ihre Folgen', in *Der Warschauer Aufstand 1944. Ereignis und Wahrnehmung in Polen und Deutschland*, ed. Hans-Jürgen Bömelburg, Eugeniusz Cezary Król and Michael Thomae, Paderborn, 2011, pp. 45–46.

2007) *Sprawa 58000 'Volksdeutschów'*, essential to the topic dealt with in his book. (Pospieszalski exposed German lies regarding the number of Germans murdered in Poland in 1939).¹³ It would be advisable to include in analysis of human losses suffered by Poland during the Second World War the volume *Polska 1939–1945. Straty osobowe i ofiary represji pod dwiema okupacjami*¹⁴ published by the Institute of National Remembrance. Worth noting among works on the 'image of enemy' is in my opinion my study offering an analysis of the image of the Pole in German caricature from the years 1914–44.¹⁵ Although the author refers to the burning of dead bodies in recounting crimes committed against Warsaw's civilian population during the Uprising (p. 285), he fails to link this with 'Aktion 1005' launched to cover up the crimes in question.¹⁶

I have no hesitation in proposing the translation of Daniel Brewing's book and the preparation of a Polish edition. It will serve as a great antidote for the Germanophobia that appears in Polish society today.

Tomasz Szarota

(Warsaw)

(Translated by Artur MękarSKI)

(Proofreading by Yelizaveta Crofts)

¹³ Karol M. Pospieszalski, *Sprawa 58000 „Volksdeutschów”*. *Sprostowanie hitlerowskich oszczerstw w sprawie strat niemieckiej mniejszości w Polsce w ostatnich miesiącach przed wybuchem wojny i w toku kampanii wrześniowej*, Poznań, 1959. It was the seventh volume of the series *Documenta Occupationis*. Two collections of documents edited by the same accomplished scholar on the Nazi occupation law in Poland D. Brewing included in his bibliography. Pospieszalski has recently been recalled by a German historian Jochen Böhrer, 'Nur ein Leben als ob', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 2 October 2017. It is a powerful article recounting the fate of Poles and Poland during the Second World War.

¹⁴ *Polska 1939–1945. Straty osobowe i ofiary represji pod dwiema okupacjami*, ed. Wojciech Materski and Tomasz Szarota, Warsaw, 2009.

¹⁵ Tomasz Szarota, 'Der Pole in der deutschen Karikatur (1914–1944). Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung nationaler Stereotype', in *Nachbarn sind der Rede wert. Bilder der Deutschen von Polen und der Polen von Deutschen in der Neuzeit*, ed. Johannes Hoffmann, Dortmund, 1997, pp. 69–102.

¹⁶ See Jens Hoffmann, 'Das kann man nicht erzählen'. *AKTION 1005 – Wie die Nazis die Spuren ihrer Massenmorde in Osteuropa beseitigten*, Hamburg, 2008; See also my text 'Die "Aktion 1005" in Warschau. Leichenverbrennung – Verwischen der Spuren begangener Verbrechen', in Tomasz Szarota, *Stereotype und Konflikte. Historische Studien zu den deutsch-polnischen Beziehungen*, Osnabrück, 2010, pp. 369–78.

Severin Gawlitta, *'Aus dem Geist des Konzils! Aus der Sorge der Nachbarn!'. Der Briefwechsel der polnischen und deutschen Bischöfe von 1965 und seine Kontexte*, Marburg: Verlag Herder-Institut, 2016, 286 pp., Studien zur Ostmitteleuropaforschung, vol. 37

The book under review is noteworthy despite the Pastoral Letter of the Polish Bishops to their German brothers and the latter's response having already been dealt with in a great number of works.¹ In writing the book, its author, an archivist from the bishopric archive in Essen, enjoyed the double advantage of a thorough knowledge of the German Catholic Church and the new source material he had found in the archival legacy of German bishops, especially from Cardinal Franz Hengsbach. Hengsbach was the first bishop of the diocese established in Essen in 1957. Because of his contacts with Polish Catholics in the Ruhr region, he became responsible for contact with the Polish Catholic Church. He participated in the Second Vatican Council.

Analysis of the discovered sources has allowed Severin Gawlitta to broaden our knowledge of the circumstances of the correspondence between Polish and German bishops, and the reaction it elicited. The author shows a good understanding of the Catholic clergy's motives and mentality, especially those who made up the German Episcopate (his understanding of the Polish Episcopate is more limited). He provides a valuable explanation of the German Episcopate's decisions' context and their link to German domestic problems. Gawlitta's interpretation is controversial insofar as he assumes that the German response remained unacknowledged and misunderstood by both contemporaries and later historians. That is why the word 'Briefwechsel' (exchange of letters), treated as the basis for the Polish-German reconciliation, and not 'Botschaft' (message), appears in the book's title.

Defined in reference to the event which became not only the founding myth of the Polish-German reconciliation, but also the symbol of reconciliation itself and appealed to both in later years and in other countries, the book's goals are naturally ambitious. The author is right in pointing out that the correspondence's history, and the effect it exerted is quite complex, and that initially it was referenced only with some restraint. Gawlitta aims to rectify what he considers to be misguided interpretations which have hindered the proper understanding of the issue. He declares his intention to offer a more detailed

¹ The discussion opened with an important book by Edith Heller, *Macht Kirche Politik. Der Briefwechsel zwischen den polnischen und deutsche Bischöfen im Jahre 1965*, Cologne, 1992, and with, *Na drodze do pojednania. Wokół orędzia biskupów polskich do biskupów niemieckich z 1965 r.*, by Piotr Madajczyk, Warsaw, 1994. The beginning of the twentieth-first century yielded important publications co-edited by Friedhelm Boll and Robert Wysocki, and works by Robert Żurek. Documents of the communist Security Service were introduced into the discussion by Wojciech Kucharski and Grzegorz Strauchold, *Wokół orędzia. Kardynał Bolesław Kominek. Prekursor pojednania polsko-niemieckiego*, ed. iidem, Wrocław, 2009.

analysis of various meetings and conversations (although it should be noted that these had also been referred to in some of the previous publications). To use this kind of evidence is to adopt the perspective of the people who were directly involved in the events under discussion.

It is necessary to express some reservations regarding this means of analysis for the testimonies of specific historical agents. Generally it raises few objections. The differing life-experiences of Cardinals Stefan Wyszyński and Bolesław Kominek have already attracted the attention of Polish historians. However, the reader is under the impression that Gawlitta is uncritical of evidence which highlights the roles of particular people and their mutual contacts. Information testifying to cordial and open meetings of members of the Episcopates of Poland and Germany should not blind us to the fact that this cordiality had to give way to social and political reality.

Of crucial importance here is the Vatican's recognition of the validity of the 1933 concordat and consequent refusal to recognize Poland's western border. In discussing the socio-political background that determined the way in which the concordat was approached in Germany and the Vatican, the author includes in his narrative the German internal policy-related strand of the issue which has been omitted from works by Polish authors, noting the significance of the concordat as an agreement to which one undivided Germany had been party (p. 35). The agreement was used as an important argument against East Berlin's demands to fit the border of the diocese to the border between the two German states, and against the policy of limiting Church education in West Germany. The Vatican suggested, and actually threatened, that the West German authorities' non-compliance with the concordat's provisions regarding education would result in drawing the relevant Church borders along Poland's western border (pp. 52–55).

At the same time, the Church in West Germany became deeply engaged in social and charitable projects aimed mainly at displaced Germans as those most in need of assistance. Consequently, it had a part in shaping the narrative of the illegality of the forced expulsions of Germans and idealized the 1950 Charter of the German Expellees (pp. 47–49). According to Gawlitta, this involved the support not for the revision of the Polish-German border, as advocated by the organizations of German expellees, but for the latter's rights to return to the lands which they were made to leave. The Vatican also advocated restraint in dealing with the border controversy in question (pp. 50–51).

Gawlitta does not have a full understanding of the factors that determined Poland's approach to the issue of reconciliation. Although he indicates the instrumental use by communist authorities of the policy pursued by Pius XII and the difficulties Polish bishops faced in representing Poland's interests after Poland's termination of the concordat in 1945, some of his opinions (pp. 56–57) suggest that he considers the Polish Episcopate's efforts during the Second Vatican Council to obtain recognition of Poland's Western border to have been the result of pressure exercised by the communist authorities — a condition forced

upon representatives of the Polish Church in order to be allowed participation in the Council.

It is difficult to understand why Chapter 2 ('Aversion und Annäherung'), devoted to the Polish-German rapprochement and the role played by the German Catholics in bringing it about, offers no account of the efforts the Wrocław Curia and Bishop Bolesław Kominek had taken in this regard since the latter half of the 1950s. The description of changes occurring in Germany, including in Catholic circles (the press, organizations) and especially in the circle of German bishops (pp. 68–73), indicates that the author's knowledge of the situation in Germany is more thorough than his knowledge of the situation in Poland. The description of the German Catholic press' reaction to the change of tone in which the Polish press wrote about West Germany is particularly notable (pp. 75–76).

Gawlitta mentions, but does not include in his argument, the well-established interpretation that the Poles considered the recognition of the Oder-Neisse border to be an integral part of the agreement while its West German advocates, who believed that a reconciliation should precede the border's recognition in order for the German expellees to become a part of it, excluded this from their considerations. Both sides differed so much in their perception of the problem that intentions and expectations diverged and the long conversations and declarations of reconciliation were not accompanied by a true mutual understanding. Gawlitta's book concerns itself essentially with this mutual misunderstanding.

The book's strength lies in the analysis of German bishops' statements regarding German guilt and Polish-German relations. The author offers a precise account of how the climate of the dialogue arose and how mutual contact was established (pp. 94–97). He also recounts the process of overcoming the mistrust of the bishops from Poland and from other countries of the Eastern Bloc, suspected of acting in collusion with the communist authorities. The use of German Church archives allows him to add new details to our knowledge of the meetings and contact held by Polish and German Church dignitaries (pp. 100–06). His analysis also involves some lesser-known aspects of the Polish-German Church contact, such as the financial support the Polish Church received from the Church in Germany or the issue of copying the archival legacy, to be found in Poland, of Cardinal Adolf Bertram, Archbishop of Wrocław.

Gawlitta, as he himself admits, lacked the source material to clarify the motives that inspired the creation of the Pastoral Letter by Polish Bishops (p. 136). It is impossible to give any definite, unequivocal answers to the question of what impact, if any, the reconciliation mass celebrated to mark the conclusion of the 1963 German-French Treaty had on, for example, Bishop Kominek. The book provides no new findings regarding the role of the Pope. Polish domestic policy is not included in the analysis of decisions taken by Cardinal Wyszyński and Bishop Kominek.²

² I believe that the reason Cardinal Wyszyński delayed his decision to accept the

Gawlitta is rational in his claim that advocacy for the Letter of Reconciliation meant abandonment of the belief that Germany should plead forgiveness first, and the acceptance of Bishop Kominek's view that Poland should initiate change in Polish-German relations with an act of forgiveness that would force Germany to apologize to victims [of the Nazi policy] (pp. 143, 149–53). Yet Gawlitta underestimates the significance of Bishop Kominek's experience as Papal Administrator in Opole during the first and most brutal years after the war. The way in which Kominek's attitude is described reveals an interesting insight to the difficulties encountered by an author who, in writing about the relations between two communities, is required to step beyond the perspective of his own culture and tradition. Gawlitta considers the Polish bishop's way of thinking to be a combination of religious and political elements (pp. 149–53) that led him to the instrumentalization of the will for reconciliation towards the political goal of the Polish-German border's recognition, and rejection of the communist system. However, the tradition of the Catholic Church in Poland was one of representing the interests of a nation deprived of its sovereignty, and the recognition of the Polish border was for the Polish Church a Church problem concerning the existence of the nation. Using in this context the word 'instrumentalization' fails to understand this unbreakable bond.

The German response was officially given on 5 December 1965. The author is right to debunk the myth regarding the difficulties (and their significance) encountered in the delivery of the Letter (pp. 157–59). This part of the work also reveals a poor knowledge of the Polish domestic policy. However, one has to agree with the opinion that the content of the Letter's disclosure had the effect of pressing the German Episcopate to give a reply while the Vatican Council was still in progress (p. 162). Equally interesting is the account of the preparation of the response and divisions among the members of the German Episcopate (pp. 169–77).

Gawlitta's argument about the strictly religious character of the Pastoral Letter and a lack of expectation on the part of its authors to elicit any declarations regarding the border is unconvincing (pp. 153–57). The main point he makes is that Polish bishops did not expect the German response to include any reference to the border and that historians are guilty of blowing the matter out of proportion (p. 177). In Gawlitta's opinion, the issue was referred to in relation to Poland's internal policy, as a safeguard against the accusations of communist authorities. However, in order to prove this view, stronger evidence is required than one sentence in a brief note attached to the Pastoral Letter, stating 'we wrote it not only for the German but also for the Polish nation'. This remark, in my opinion, is indicative of the fact that the authors of the Letter aimed, among other things, to contribute to the transformation of the mentality and political culture of the Polish nation. According to Gawlitta, what also speaks in favour of his interpretation is the importance attached by Bishop Kominek to the rapprochement between

Pastoral Letter was not a lack of alternative options (the opinion expressed by the author, p. 143) but his view of Poland's internal situation.

the two nations (pp. 179–80). This, however, does not conflict with striving for the border's recognition.

The intention to defend the position taken by the German bishops leads Gawlitta to advance some vague arguments according to which the German expellees were not the reason for the restraint with which the Germans responded to the Polish Letter. The authors of the response in question simply wanted to include the expellees, whom they knew to oppose the recognition of Poland's western border, in the reconciliation process. This is an important clarification, but it does not change the essence of the matter.

To claim that Polish bishops were not as critical of the German response as usually assumed rejects Edith Heller's interpretation of the Polish Episcopate's communiqué of 7 December 1965 (p. 213). In it, the German response was referred to by the restrained term 'positive', which Heller found to be an expression of a deeply negative view of the response. Gawlitta also downplays the significance of Wyszyński's and Kominek's later critical opinions, but he does not offer a convincing explanation³ of their aim. He also contests two charges. Firstly, he does not agree with the opinion that German bishops failed to understand the Pastoral Letter's authors' intentions of emphasizing Poland's bond with the West. In his opinion, they discerned it but believed it counter-productive to the process of reconciliation to embark on a discussion of historical issues. Secondly, he rejects the view that they failed to understand the wider meaning of the Letter.⁴ However, Gawlitta's line of reasoning indicates that he fails to understand what it meant in Poland in 1965 to ignore the existence of GDR in Polish-German discussions.

This part of the book (Chapter 5.1) leaves the reader under the impression that the author has failed to see that he was describing a strange dialogue in which both sides did not understand their mutual expectations. Arguing that the issue of the Polish-German border was not of key importance and citing German bishops' remarks on their positive reaction to the Polish bishops' response, he fails to notice that Cardinal Wyszyński's statement (p. 219), which he also cites, placed a special emphasis on the need to 'ensure Poland's existence within the existing borders'. Of particular note is the author's reference to the 1966 correspondence between the Cardinal and Bishop Kominek. This source material bears testimony to the high regard in which Kominek held the idea of the correspondence (p. 219). The question which arises here is whether Cardinal Wyszyński and Bishop Kominek differed from each other in their expectations regarding

³ The argument regarding statements made by Polish bishops on account of the communist authorities appears to be used in the book as an interpretative skeleton-key.

⁴ It seems as if the author of the work, scholarly in character, found himself obliged to defend the honour of German bishops. This strikes a note of discord in the book. A critical view of the German response is in his opinion either *Unterstellung* (insinuation), or an accusation brought against these bishops that they displayed no deeper intellectual qualities (pp. 217–18).

the German response. I believe that this was the case, but further research is needed to answer this question.

Worth noting is an interesting chapter (5.2, 'Polenarbeit der deutschen Bischöfe') in which the case of the bishopric in Essen is used to illustrate the efforts taken by the Catholic Church in Germany in the latter half of the 1960s to advance the Polish-German reconciliation.

To conclude, Severin Gawlitta's book is a significant contribution to academic reflection on the exchange of letters between Polish and German bishops. It brings into circulation new church sources, especially those regarding Bishop Franz Hengsbach, and provides a new interpretation of German bishops' response to the Pastoral Letter and their view of the pursuit of Polish-German reconciliation. Without accepting some of the opinions expressed by the author, who has a better understanding of the German than of the Polish reality, it must be said that his book provides inspiration for further critical reflection on this fragment of Polish-German history.

Piotr Madajczyk
(Warsaw)

(Translated by Artur Mękowski)
(Proofreading by Yelizaveta Crofts)