

spent some years in Marki at the beginning of the 20th century, provided inspiration for her interest in the story of the mills in Marki. This personal involvement and the hard work of the author resulted in the most detailed and comprehensive study of the Bradford Mills in Marki depicted in a broad context of political and economic history of the late 19th century. The work is easy to read and receive because of its excellent narrative style and the language. D. has been conducting her research work for more than five years. As a result the volume constitutes a substantial contribution to the industrial history of Poland and Britain.

Kraków

Piotr Franaszek

Dangiras Mačiulis, Darius Staliūnas: Lithuanian Nationalism and the Vilnius Question, 1883-1940. (Studien zur Ostmitteleuropaforschung, Bd. 32.) Verl. Herder-Institut. Marburg 2015. 236 S., Ill. ISBN 978-3-87969-401-3. (€ 45,-).

The monograph by the two historians Dangiras Mačiulis and Darius Staliūnas illustrates how the idea of a Lithuanian nation including Vilnius was established in Lithuanian society from the end of the nineteenth century to the 1940s. The authors try to trace the development of the idea of Vilnius as the historical, cultural and political capital of Lithuania. The main focus is put on the city of Vilnius and not on the Vilnius region, which was also a part of nationalistic claims, because the city was understood as an urban centre of power in the region where cultural, religious and political interests crossed. The basic sources for this book are Lithuanian, Polish, Russian and Yiddish periodicals (magazines and newspapers) from that time. The Herder Institute published this work in English, while the Lithuanian Institute of History published an expanded Lithuanian edition a little bit later in 2015.¹ Both books were funded by a grant from the Research Council of Lithuania.

This study has five thematic chapters, which describe Vilnius in different historical periods. The first chapter examines the city during the Tsarist Russian period, when the first rudiments of Lithuanian nationalism appeared with the founding of the illegal Lithuanian newspaper *Aušra* in Prussian Lithuania 1883. Real activity of Lithuanians in Vilnius dates back to the beginning of the 20th century, when the idea of Vilnius as the capital of modern Lithuania came into being following the Great Seimas of Lithuania in 1905. Before the First World War, Vilnius was the organizational centre of the Lithuanian national movement, where different Lithuanian societies were founded. Those societies played an important role in mobilizing the Lithuanian community. The second chapter describes the situation during the First World War and the proclamation of Lithuanian independence in 1918 with Vilnius as capital. Chapter three is devoted to the most complicated period of the city's history, 1918-1923, when different aspirations to the city were clearly visible. The loss of Vilnius in 1920 caused a wave of patriotism in Lithuania. The Conference of Ambassadors of 1923, which confirmed Poland's eastern borders but was rejected by Lithuania, marked the end of Lithuania's international aspirations to Vilnius. Chapter four examines the Lithuanian campaign to liberate the capital during the Interwar Period. The myth of Vilnius was by that time an integral part of Lithuanian nationalism, resulting in the creation of a strong propaganda organ known as the Vilnius Liberation Union (1925-1938), which ideologically influenced the Lithuanian population. Symbolic images of Vilnius were used for propaganda campaigns, but the passivity of Lithuanian society to the idea of the liberation of Vilnius was still predominant. The idea of a Lithuanian Vilnius appeared particularly in geography textbooks, descriptions of pilgrimages, poetry, works of art,

¹ DANGIRAS MAČIULIS, DARIUS STALIŪNAS: Vilnius—Lietuvos sostinė: problema tautinės valstybės projekte (XIX a. pabaiga – 1940 m.) [Vilnius—Capital of Lithuania. The Problem of a Nation-State Project (Late 19th c. – 1940)], Vilnius 2015.

press, maps and religious symbols. The final chapter analyses the period between 1939-1940, when the capital was recovered and a policy of Lithuanisation took place.

At the end of the book are summaries in English and German, a list of abbreviations, bibliography and index of persons. However, it does not include a bibliographic listing of every journal article.

This book contains a great deal of information about the Lithuanian national movement, its creation and development. It also examines the issue of Lithuanian political parties vis-à-vis the question of Vilnius, which from the beginning of the 20th century spoke out for an independent Lithuania. However, Lithuanian political groups solved the problem of Vilnius very differently. A large part of this work discusses events connected with Lithuanian aspirations to Vilnius. Discussions of Polish, Jewish and Belarusian aspirations also appear in this book but less so. This study is generously illustrated with historical photos, postcards, posters and cartoons from newspapers or journals. The illustrations certainly increase the charm of this work.

This book is valuable because it works mainly with Lithuanian primary sources and explains their content in English to readers who do not have the Lithuanian language skills to launch such research. This study makes a significant contribution in the fields of Baltic and Eastern European history and Lithuanian nationalism. It certainly provides substantial input to the body of literature about the idea of Vilnius for Lithuania.

Vilnius

Tomaš Nenartovič

Klaus Richter: Antisemitismus in Litauen. Christen, Juden und die „Emanzipation“ der Bauern (1889-1914). (Studien zum Antisemitismus in Europa, Bd. 4.) Metropol. Berlin 2013. 447 S., 12 Kt. ISBN 978-3-86331-124-7. (€ 24,-)

Darius Staliūnas: Enemies For a Day. Antisemitism and Anti-Jewish Violence in Lithuania under the Tsars. (Historical Studies in Eastern Europe and Eurasia, Bd. 3.) CEU Press. Budapest u. a. 2015. XII, 284 S. ISBN 978-963-386-072-4. (€ 30,-)

Die beiden zu besprechenden Arbeiten beschäftigen sich mit dem litauisch-jüdischen Verhältnis am Ende des 19. und zu Beginn des 20. Jh. Klaus Richter, dessen Buch auf seiner 2011 an der TU Berlin eingereichten Dissertation beruht, geht es darum, „die Entwicklung des Antisemitismus, des litauischen Nationalismus und der christlich-jüdischen Beziehungen als ergebnisoffenen Prozess zu untersuchen“ (S. 11). Methodologisch setzt er dabei auf einen „praxeologische[n] Ansatz, der Wissen und Praxis der Akteure ins Zentrum stellt“ (S. 25), und geht der Frage nach, ob „der Weltanschauungscharakter von Antisemitismus und Nationalismus“ (S. 25) auch in der litauischen Provinz anzutreffen ist.

Völlig zu Recht erweitert der Vf. diesen Ansatz durch die Suche nach Ursachen aus den bäuerlichen Lebenswelten: „Antisemitismus wird entsprechend nicht als ‚chimärisch‘ begriffen, sondern als Manifestation eines Interessenkonflikts und somit als eine spezielle Form des ‚Fremdmachens‘“ (S. 25). Dabei geht es auch um eine eingehende Untersuchung der von R. als „Kontaktzonen“ bezeichneten Bereiche, in denen es zu wirtschaftlichen, aber auch zu jüdisch-christlichen Interaktionen kam (S. 27). In der Tat beschreitet R. damit Neuland: „Antisemitismus wird hier als Versuch verstanden, den ‚eigenen Raum‘ gegen Jude [sic] zu sichern und gleichzeitig auf ‚jüdischen‘ Raum auszugreifen. Dies kann sprachlich geschehen oder durch die tatsächliche Überschreitung von physikalischen Grenzen“ (S. 28).

Wichtig ist dem Autor der Hinweis, dass die national-ethnische Zuordnung „litauisch“ keine Identitätsschiffre für die sich als Hiesige definierende Landbevölkerung dargestellt habe. Überregional kann von Christen und Bauern als Identifikationsmuster gesprochen werden. In dem anschließenden Kapitel „Der ländliche Raum und das Dorf“ stellt der Vf. die Bühne für die folgende Darstellung vor, die in dem Unterkapitel „Topografie und Wandel der Sclttelech“ um die jüdische Perspektive ergänzt wird. Interessant, zumal für Litauischkundige, sind die Ausführungen zum Gebrauch des Wortes „žydas“ (Jude) und