

of the original bull with which Pope Alexander III confirmed the decisions reached at Łęczyca.

In his teaching, Grodecki devoted two academic years, 1928–29 and 1947–48, to the internal history of thirteenth-century Poland. The 350-page section of *Polska Piastowska* derived from these efforts deals with the structure of the state, evolution of society, and economic change. His point of departure was the predominantly constitutional work of earlier scholars, but the result in these pages is a picture of Poland's institutions that is less legally oriented and more sociological in nature, more integrated and less compartmentalized, than that given by his predecessors. Only in two areas may he be particularly faulted. He pays less attention to spiritual and psychic factors than now seems warranted by the work of recent scholars; and he underrates the significance of economic development, particularly urban growth, in this period. This latter criticism is particularly ironic, because one of the best sections of this book is the 120-page analysis, having its genesis in the academic year 1926–27, of the economic activity of Casimir the Great.

This topic has long been on the periphery of the contributions of previous Casimiran specialists, but Grodecki is the first to provide anything like a complete treatment. He goes beyond the question of the royal treasury and its income to investigate the larger question of both the direct and the indirect economic impact of King Casimir's activity. He concludes that the monarchy had a highly sophisticated understanding of the relation between politics and the economy. This article has already been suggestive to contemporary scholars in Poland. The final long article on the Jews in Poland, to about 1400, is not primarily concerned with the inner life of the Jewish community. It concentrates instead on the role of the Jews in the society and economy of the medieval Polish state. Based entirely on primary sources and the most reliable secondary material, this study maintains the high level of excellence which is the ideal of all who teach and write.

PAUL W. KNOLL

*University of Southern California*

EUROPA A ROZBIORY POLSKI: STUDIUM HISTORIOGRAFICZNE. By  
*Marian Henryk Serejski*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1970.  
518 pp. 60 zł.

Was Poland murdered or did she commit suicide? This question has concerned historians ever since the partitions. Although it is a problem that has especially obsessed Polish historians, foreigners have also entered into polemics. The author and editor of several valuable studies of Polish historiography, Marian Serejski undertakes here to document at great length the attitudes of non-Poles. He analyzes the period from the eighteenth century to 1914, dividing it into five subperiods: the Enlightenment, the Napoleonic Period to 1831, the romantic-democratic era (1831–48), retreat from romantic liberalism (1848–70), and finally the period of armed peace (1871–1914). In handling each period, Serejski examines the views of professional historians, interested journalists, and other makers of opinion to see how they apportion responsibility for the partitions. Was Polish backwardness (especially constitutional) to blame, or were the three partitioning powers guilty? If the latter, was any power more guilty than the others?

Readers will not be surprised to learn that writers tended to define their posi-

tions in terms of their general political orientation, especially with reference to the foreign policies which they urged upon their governments—or their governments urged on them. Massive documentation seems unnecessary to prove this point. The reader may wonder why Serejski chose to analyze historiography only up to 1914, when recent decades offer such fascinating examples of historical studies that coincide exactly with national policy. In his last paragraph Serejski explains that “European historical opinion” opposed the partitions and therefore favored the re-emergence of an independent Poland after World War I. This point, questionable in view of Serejski’s own evidence, would have been better supported by analyzing the thoughts of European statesmen at the Paris Peace Conference and the views of their experts.

A sixteen-page French summary makes the work accessible to non-Polish readers.

DANIEL STONE  
University of Winnipeg

FILOZOFIA A MESJANIZM: STUDIA Z DZIEJÓW FILOZOFII I MYŚLI  
SPOŁECZNO-RELIGIJNEJ ROMANTYZMU POLSKIEGO. By *Andrzej  
Walicki*. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1970. 318 pp. 45 zł.

Walicki’s book consists of four papers on Polish romantic *Weltanschauungen*. In the first two Mickiewicz’s messianism is confronted with the philosophies of August Cieszkowski and Bronisław Trentowski. The third, on Karol Libelt’s “Slavic philosophy,” is a reprint of an introductory essay to a selection of Libelt’s works. The fourth paper was prompted by Herzen’s remark characterizing Mickiewicz as a Polish counterpart of “Khomiakov & Co.” In his detailed and authoritative exposition Walicki (the author of a book on the Russian Slavophiles, *W kręgu konserwatywnej utopii*) proves that despite some striking resemblances this was not so.

All the essays, with the exception of the third one, have as their main protagonist Mickiewicz’s Parisian lectures, a work sadly neglected in Polish scholarship until recently. By overemphasizing the contrast between the “sober” Mickiewicz of the initial lectures and the fervid Towiański propagandist of the last ones, scholars have overlooked the basic unity of the whole. Moreover, they have displayed a tendency to isolate passages palatable to them and to disregard the context. Walicki’s approach, like Zofia Stefanowska’s in her fine recent paper “Slavonic Legend in Mickiewicz’s Parisian Lectures” (*Pamiętnik Literacki*, 1968), is “holistic.” This approach is much more fruitful than previous ones, and does some justice to this vast, rich, rambling, and occasionally baffling work.

Two problems especially preoccupy Walicki. He wants to analyze the meaning of Mickiewicz’s messianism in a more precise and unambiguous way than was possible in the past, and by comparing Mickiewicz’s attitudes with those of other thinkers of his time he wants to fix the poet’s place in Polish romantic philosophy. On the way he sheds considerable light on those other thinkers as well. Thus he gives the reader a deeper insight into the spiritual climate of late Polish romanticism, and since he is at home in the French, German, and Russian thought of the period, he is especially good in tracing both the European connections of the Polish romantic thinkers and their original contributions to romantic thought. All in all, this is a highly stimulating and instructive book.