

ten Fachbegriffe stören derart zahlreiche Grammatik- und Rechtschreibfehler besonders, da sie die ohnehin mitunter komplizierte Lektüre noch mehr erschweren.

Fraglich bleibt letztlich z. B., ob „historische Zeit“ tatsächlich „den wichtigste[!] Schlüssel für die Zugehörigkeit zur europäisch-kolonialen Moderne sowie jene universalistische Größe [bildet], mit der diese Zugehörigkeit verhandelt und gemessen wird“ (S. 20) oder ob nicht doch kulturelle Gemeinsamkeiten wichtiger sind bzw. ob die untersuchten Zeitschriften tatsächlich Zeit „schaffen“ – z. B. die Jahrhundertwende als solche u. a. durch ihre aufgedruckten Erscheinungsdaten erst als solche erfahrbar machen – oder sie doch eher nur abbilden.

Wer es nicht scheut, sich in diese theorielastige Zeit-Untersuchung einzulesen, findet nach der Gewöhnung an teils sperriges neues Vokabular in den konkret untersuchten Presseartikeln viel interessantes historisch-historiografisches Material polnischer Provenienz sowie Informationen zur Zeitschriftenlandschaft in den drei Teilungsgebieten.

Marburg

Jan Lipinsky

**Denkmalschutz – Architekturforschung – Baukultur.** Entwicklungen und Erscheinungsformen in den baltischen Ländern vom späten 19. Jahrhundert bis heute. Hrsg. von Andreas Fülberth. (Visuelle Geschichtskultur, Bd. 18.) Böhlau. Köln u. a. 2020. 304 S., Ill. ISBN 978-3-412-50093-1. (€ 39,99.)

Heritage is a topic that is inevitably related to social and political dimensions and is hence relevant beyond specialized circles. There are many un(der)researched topics in that field in the Baltic region: each new publication—particularly in German/English—is a welcome addition. The editor highlights (p. 13) that the focus here is not the history of heritage protection, but rather its ideological aspects. Building on the 2016 conference “Denkmalschutz im Baltikum—Probleme, Potentiale, politische Bedeutung” in Leipzig, additional authors have now joined in. The contributors include both emerging and established scholars (some of whom critically reassess their own previous work) from the Baltic states, Poland and Germany. Research into those issues tends to be dominated by architectural historians, and that is the case here as well.

The book begins with three introductions: the foreword by Arnold Bartetzky opens up the project background; Andreas Fülberth offers his vision of approaching the topic, adding some words about heritage management in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; and Alexander von Knorre provides his own brief account on the latter topic.<sup>1</sup>

In what follows, it becomes evident that most of the ten compelling articles actually focus on Soviet and post-Soviet developments. Krista Kodres and Mārtiņš Mintauris continue with the management of heritage preservation, concentrating on Soviet Estonia and Latvia respectively, and offering great parallels on the topic in its entirety. Two articles are concerned with the conservation and reconstruction of medieval and early modern architecture since the 1990s: Anneli Randa considers churches in Estonia and Tomasz Torbus discusses the Palace of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania. Three articles focus on the present evaluation, conservation and neglect of monuments originating from the 1850s to 1930s—Ieva Kalnača writes on neoislamic design in Livonia, adding further notes to the early history of conservation, Mart Kalm considers the highlights of Estonian modernism, and Gytis Oržikauskas focuses on the stylistic variety of interwar Kaunas. The first two revolve around the difficulty of protecting interior architecture.

Another three articles, all devoted to Lithuania, concentrate on recent architecture and its reception—Viltė Janušauskaitė and Felix Ackermann discuss the fate of Soviet modernism (some of which was remarkably enlisted under protection immediately after completion); and Evelina Karalevičienė writes about a massive new addition to the

<sup>1</sup> For more see MĀRTIŅŠ MINTAURIS: Latvia’s Architectural Heritage and Its Protection 1880–1940, in: *Journal of Baltic Studies* 37 (2006), 3, pp. 298–312.

urban setting of Kaunas. In addition, Fülberth follows the discussions on the planning of Latvian small towns since the 1960s. Presenting it within his introduction leads the reader to believe that it is somehow key to the whole book, while perhaps it would have deserved to be developed into a separate article (recent research in Estonia offers fine comparison<sup>2</sup>).

Lithuania does not merit a general account at the beginning, but half of the book's articles are in fact about this state. Torbus gives an insight into interwar conservation principles in Vilnius under Polish legislation. While it has been claimed that the system lagged behind that of neighboring states in the rest of interwar Lithuania, in the Soviet period it was relatively effective; less so in the post-Soviet years.<sup>3</sup> Although this might be a question of interpretation, it is interesting to see that the protection was allegedly rather inefficient in Soviet Latvia (Mintaus, pp. 85, 92, 95), whereas in Estonia, the 1970s marked the extensive rediscovery of both manor architecture (Kodres, p. 58) and interwar modernism (Kalm). Also the post-1990 general management of Estonian sacral monuments (Randla) and twentieth-century architecture (Kalm)<sup>4</sup> is covered in the book.

Torbus and Karalevičienė offer captivating, benevolent analyses of structures that have received strong criticism: the newly built Vilnius palace (although the authors' take on the Polishness/Lithuanianess involved remains unclear, pp. 236, 254–257) and the Akropolis shopping mall in Kaunas (though the title refers to new architecture more generally). I also yearned for more examples and references when reading Oržikauskas' problematization of the historiography on Kaunas modernism, and Janušauskaitė's claim (p. 185) that Russian activity in Crimea has considerably shaped Lithuanian attitudes towards Soviet architecture.

The most polemic article is that by Ackermann on the historiography of the "Knights of Architecture," apparently a common phrase to refer to the more "forward-thinking" Soviet Lithuanian architects. It is written as an answer to the rich work of Marija Drėmaitė (an aim that becomes evident halfway through the article), who has indeed acquired something of a monopoly for introducing Lithuanian modernism on the international scene. That position can be questioned, but Ackermann's conclusions (e.g. regarding family relations) seem hasty, and his connection with New Art History (p. 205) remains loose.

Fülberth also comes up in the role of translator and photographer of most of the items in the book. It has to be said that the colorful contemporary images do not always serve the aims of the historical articles that they accompany, though: Kalnača's illustrations of fragments do not really give an impression of a neoislamic interior; two central instances from Vilnius discussed by both Ackermann and Janušauskaitė—the Lazdynai mass housing district and café Neringa—are sadly not visualized in any way.

The latter two articles yet again bring to mind the fact that although many of the issues faced are similar across the Eastern bloc, each nation often chooses to carry out research in isolation. When looking at the Finnish and Swedish influences on Baltic post-war modernism and relating identity building, for example, Jaak Kangilaski's three-fold model of the

<sup>2</sup> In addition to Kodres' chapter see OLIVER ORRO: *Moodne muinsuskaitse hilisnõukogude ühiskonnas: Haapsalu ja Lihula muinsuskaitsealast 1970.–1980. aastail* [Modern Heritage Protection in Late Soviet Society: On the Conservation Areas of Haapsalu and Lihula in the 1970s and 1980s], in: *Läänemaa Muuseumi toimetised* 18 (2015), pp. 255–290; OLIVER ORRO: *Süsteemaatiliste unistuste aeg: Muinsuskaitsealade planeeringutest Eestis 1960.–80. aastatel* [An Era of Systematic Dreams: On the Planning of Conservation Areas in Estonia in 1960s–1980s], in: ANNELI RANDLA (ed.): *Aja lugu: Muinsuskaitse ja restaureerimise ajaloost*, Tallinn 2016, pp. 93–160.

<sup>3</sup> MARGARITA JANUŠONIENĖ: *State Protection of the Art Heritage in Lithuania 1919–2006: Historical Development and Results. Summary of Doctor Dissertation Humanities, Art Criticism* (03 H), Vilnius 2009, pp. 25–30, see also pp. 15–17.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. INGRID RUUDI: *Spaces of the Interregnum: Transformations in Estonian Architecture and Art 1986–1994*, Tallinn 2020, pp. 178–198.

hybrid simultaneity of conservative nationalism, (the influences of) the Western avant-garde and (the acceptability to) the Socialist Realist discourse<sup>5</sup> could be taken advantage of. Modernity is highly ambivalent,<sup>6</sup> (as also Oržikauskas and Kalm demonstrate in the case of interwar architecture) and so are identities.

It is a pity that the longer history of Baltic heritage preservation, conservation and historiography is seldom addressed. Readers who take the nineteenth century as stated in the book title seriously might be left disappointed. To understand the heritage movement of the late 1980s along with its powerful national agenda (that is named among the book's main triggers, p. 11) it is useful to know about the earlier "manipulations" with monuments that these build on. Not informing the reader of the universal tendencies and traditions of art history might even lead to false conclusions, as if the close relationship between monuments, identity construction and power play was only the case in the Soviet context (cf. pp. 24, 54, 80, 212–215, 218).<sup>7</sup> It is characteristic of heritage to be concerned with the present, but Heritage Studies, which would be a perfect fit for research on such ideological aspects, is not referred to, although the main concepts and their different nuances depending on the language are touched upon (pp. 23, 33). While German influences can historically be seen in Latvian and Estonian terminology, in Soviet times Russian shaped the institutional language of all three Baltic states.

What do these contributions add to the state of research? Moreover, who is their target audience? A significant role of such books is to introduce the existing body of research conducted in the local languages. Several authors have indeed chosen to translate their already published texts or combine their fragments for an international audience, which makes the book something of an anthology. (An error needs to be corrected on p. 52 regarding the training of heritage conservators in Soviet Estonia: Kodres' source text suggests that this was done precisely in the course of practice, not the other way round.) Despite some minor shortcomings, the book significantly enriches research on the topic, helping the reader to understand recent preservation activities as well as today's developments. Its most essential function is thus to introduce local scholarship within East Central Europe itself.

Tallinn

Kristina Jõekalda

<sup>5</sup> JAAK KANGILASKI: Three Paradigms of Estonian Art during the Soviet Occupation, in: SIRJE HELME (ed.): *Different Modernisms, Different Avant-gardes: Problems in Central and Eastern European Art after World War II*, Tallinn 2009, pp. 118–122. Cf. KRISTA KODRES: *The Soviet West? The Shifting Boundaries of Estonian Culturescape*, in: NATALYA ZLYDNEVA (ed.): *At the Crossroads of the East and the West: The Problems of Borderzone in Russian and Central European Cultures*, Moskva 2021, pp. 427–444.

<sup>6</sup> ZYGMUNT BAUMAN: *Liquid Modernity*, Cambridge, MA 2000.

<sup>7</sup> See KRISTA KODRES: *Architekurgeschichte und Kulturerbe in Estland: Eine wechselseitige Beziehung*, in: STEPHANIE HEROLD, ANNELI RANDLA et al. (eds.): *Renationalisierung oder Sharing Heritage: Wo steht die Denkmalpflege im europäischen Kulturbereich 2018?*, Holzminden 2019, pp. 20–29.

**Larry Wolff: Woodrow Wilson and the Reimagining of Eastern Europe.** Stanford University Press. Stanford, California 2020. XI, 286 S. ISBN 978-1-5036-1118-4. (\$ 84,-)

Kein amerikanischer Präsident vor oder nach ihm habe sich so sehr für das östliche Europa interessiert und sich so intensiv mit der Region beschäftigt wie Woodrow Wilson, lautet ein Befund des zu besprechenden Buches. Polen, die Tschechoslowakei und der jugoslawische Staat seien seine Herzensangelegenheit gewesen, und seine Vision einer nationalstaatlichen Ordnung im Osten Europas habe sich durchgesetzt. Der viel diskutierten Frage, wie weit Wilson als deren Schöpfer gelten kann, geht Larry Wolff jedoch um-