
Book Reviews

Joanna Kulwicka-Kamińska, *Przekład terminologii religijnej islamu w polskich tłumaczeniach Koranu na tle biblijnej tradycji translatorycznej* (Toruń: Wydawnictwo naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 2013), 357 pp. with attached CD-Rom.

Translation—the communication of meaning from one cultural-linguistic environment to another—is always a difficult undertaking even if the text or message is relatively simple, and the source and target languages are closely related in grammatical structure and lexical formation. When the act of translation involves the transmission of esoteric doctrine and core beliefs from one religion to another, from one canonical language to another, it poses even greater challenges. In such cases it is often impossible to find appropriate formal (literal) equivalences in the target language, shaped and honed by specific philosophic traditions and cultural practices. Consequently, there is usually a need for creative paraphrasing, i.e. the use of “dynamic” equivalences that convey the sense of the original text by using terms and conceptual references that resonate in the target language without distorting the implicit and explicit meaning of the source-text. There is a growing body of scholarship on this topic with particular regard to the foundation texts of the credal religions of the world. It is a huge and complex subject, requiring knowledge of such subjects as religious history, comparative philology, semantics, textual criticism and cultural studies as well as the appropriate languages and, in some cases, calligraphic skills.

This new work by Joanna Kulwicka-Kamińska fits within this discipline. Her main focus is Polish renderings of Islamic terminology. To contextualize this study, she compares Polish translations of the Quran, to Polish translations of the Bible. It is an ambitious undertaking, since these Polish texts-in-translation are the products of very different traditions. Christianity was brought to Poland through the Czech and German lands in the mid-10th century. The first surviving text in Polish, part of a trilingual Latin-German-Polish Psalter, dates from the mid-14th century. There were further translations of the Psalms and other Biblical extracts in the following century, but the first full translation of the Polish Bible to appear in print was the Brest Bible of 1563, which drew on Hebrew and Aramaic sources for the Old Testament, Greek and Latin for the New Testament. By this time the Reformation was in full swing and two more translations, reflecting different theological positions and hence different terminological nuances, were published a few years later, followed by another, the Danzig Bible, in 1632. All these translations were undertaken by highly educated scholars, well versed in Christian theology.

Translations of the Quran into Polish were undertaken in very different circumstances. There were two distinct strands. The first was the manuscript literature of the Tatar emigrants from the Golden Horde, who began to settle in the Kingdom of Poland and adjacent territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the 14th century. They were relatively new converts to Islam, but nevertheless deeply devoted to their faith. Within a century or so they had largely forgotten their native languages and spoke only Polish and Belarusian (the official language of the Grand Duchy). At around this time (probably in the early 16th century) they began to produce handwritten Islamic texts in these languages, which they transcribed phonetically into the Arabic script—a script

which has great symbolic significance for Muslims around the world. This religious literature comprises a number of genres, the main categories being the *kitab*—collections of prayers, homiletic texts, sayings of the Prophet and short passages from the Quran), and *tefsir*—the complete Arabic text of the Quran, with interlinear explanations (translations of the Quran are not canonically acceptable, since it is regarded as a divinely revealed text) into Polish-Belarusian, likewise written in the Arabic script. The scribes who copied these works may sometimes have been working from models that had originally been written by erudite scholars, but quite often they reveal a weak grasp of Islamic doctrine and law, and in sections where Arabic is used it is frequently grammatically incorrect.

The second strand in the introduction of the Quran into Polish was via Latin (the earliest extant Latin translation dates from 1143) and other European languages (Italian, French, Spanish, and English); some of these versions portrayed Islam in an extremely negative light, especially during the Reformation. By the 19th century, however, more accurate translations and commentaries were produced by scholars who had a sound knowledge of Arabic and of Islamic teachings. The first printed text of the Quran in Polish was published in 1858. Other translations appeared in the 20th century, some of which reflected sectarian divisions within the Muslim community (for example, the version produced by the Ahmadiyya movement).

This huge corpus of scriptural literature provides source material for the present study. It is, by any standards, a brave and ambitious undertaking. As the title of the work indicates, the primary aim is to select essential semantic concepts and to compare and contrast the way in which they have been transmitted from the source languages—i.e. the Arabic of the Quran and the polyglot origins of the Bible—into Polish. The result is a painstaking, diligent compilation of a great mass of comparative lexical material. There is some attempt to establish the intellectual and cultural aspects of the different “schools” of translation, but this is secondary to the main endeavor and is somewhat obscured by the weight of illustrative textual references. Thus, as an exploration of the wider topic of the transmission of ideas it is of limited value. However, as a terminological study, it will doubtless be of considerable assistance to scholars of Polish lexicology, likewise to students of inter-linguistic communication. There is an excellent Bibliography. The work is completed by the accompanying CD-ROM, which compares fundamental Quranic and Biblical tenets of faith, such as belief in God, the Prophets, the Angels and the Last Judgement.

SHIRIN AKINER

Jolanta Sujecka, ed., *Macedonia: Land, Region, Borderland* [Ser: Colloquia Balkanica, Vol 2] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG and Faculty of Artes Liberales, University of Warsaw, 2013), 581 pp.

In the early 20th century Macedonia, then an Ottoman territory surrounded by enemy Christian nation-states and Austria-Hungary, fell prey to its neighbors during the two Balkan wars. They continued bickering about the partition of this land during the Great War. The multiethnic and polyconfessional character of Macedonia, which for centuries was the norm across (mostly Central and Eastern) Europe and the Ottoman lands, abruptly came to be seen as "abnormal." The normative ethnolinguistic-cum-ethnoreligious homogeneity was opposed to the Macedonian diversity, with each neighbor (except for equally diverse Austria-Hungary) pent up on annexing Macedonia insisting that only its own homogeneity was appropriate for this land, meaning that all of Macedonia should be granted to this nation-state. However, other national polities disagreed. The subsequent cycles of conflicts (fueled by the Western European "Great Powers," alongside Russia and Austria-Hungary, supporting different local polities) resulted in expulsions of millions, forced assimilation and multilateral strife over the "correct" interpretation of Macedonia's past. The scores were largely settled early in the wake of World War II. The Cold War with its fault line of the Iron Curtain running in the Balkans across historical Macedonia stifled (with the use of nuclear deterrent) any further border changes. The fall of communism and the subsequent slow-motion breakup of Yugoslavia reopened this old-style contest that at present focuses on the name of the independent national polity of post-Yugoslav Macedonia, the name that is contested by Greece but, *nomen omen*, fully accepted in Turkey. At present the Macedonian nation-state actively espouses the antiquity of this historic land by overhauling it into the very basis of its own national master narrative, much to chagrin of Greece. Bulgaria which was the first state to recognize the independence of Macedonia in 1991, denies the existence of any Macedonian language or nation.

This century-long commotion is a function of the disagreement on the fact that a common past may yield separate presents. The book under review peers under the heated discussions and disentangles what actually underlies pet stereotypes and beliefs. It is a cross between a multi-author monograph and a versatile reference on matters Macedonian as set against the broader historical, social, ideological and ethnic context of the Balkans. The volume opens with the section on the "History" of Macedonia. Jacek Rzepka, on the basis of his close reading of Greek and Latin texts, offers a nuanced analysis of the inclusion and exclusion of (as yet non-Slavophone) Macedonians from the Greek ethnocultural commonality in antiquity. Irena Stefoska reflects on what various medieval authors understood under the name of Macedonia, while Dragi G'orgiev does the same for the modern period under Ottoman rule, where the use of the name Macedonia markedly declined in frequency. This section is wrapped up with the etymological and ethnological analysis of Macedonian, Turkish and Albanian terms employed for expressing territorial origin and ethnicity of human groups in historic Macedonia, as surveyed in the articles by Jolanta Sujecka, Olimpia Dragouni and Rigels Halili.

The other section, "Context," consists of three subsections on "Popular Literature," "Ideology," alongside "Language and Ethnos." In the first subsection, Katerina Mladenovska-Ristovska and Krzysztof Usakiewicz present the history and subsequent

dissemination of the Alexander Romance through centuries and languages across Christian and Muslim lands, before focusing on various political and legitimizing uses of the historical figure of Alexander the Great in the current age of nationalism among various Balkan national movements. This discussion appropriately opens the subsection on "Ideology." Sanja Roić and Maciej Falski delve into the early modern Latin- and Italian-language works on Slavs and their history in the Balkans, alongside the subsequent 19th-century uses of the narratives for nation-building purposes. Likewise, Wojciech Sajkowski analyzes the reception of these works in France during the Enlightenment, showing that it was the channel through which information and ideas on the Balkan (Southern) Slavs spread across Western Europe. On this basis, the four further authors from this section focus squarely on the various employments of the past for writing and legitimizing national master narratives in the 20th century. Bogdan Trifunović analyzes how the Serbian artist Paja Jovanović utilized Tsar Dušan and his medieval Balkan empire for building a Serbian national feeling through the medium of historical painting. Ermis Lafaznovski presents the emigration of Slavophone Macedonians from Greece's section of historical Macedonia (so-called Aegean Macedonia) in the wake of the Greek Civil War and its importance for the Macedonian national identity formation in Yugoslavia's Macedonia, while Alexandra Ioannidou probes into how the issue is reflected in the Macedonian-language novels by Taško Georgievski and Kica Kolbe. This subsection is concluded with Olimpia Dagouni's reflection on the image of Macedonia in Greek history textbooks, in which the objectivizing approach is rather discouraged in favor of solidifying a stereotype that reinforces the currently obtaining Greek national master narrative.

In the last subsection, on "Language and Ethnos," Marjan Marković and Irena Sawicka present the salient linguistic features of the Macedonian language on the basis of which they claim that Macedonian is the "most central" language in the Balkan linguistic area (*Sprachbund*), while extremely peripheral in the genetic family of the Slavic languages. Last but not least, Rigels Halili dwells on the history and present-day situation of Slavic-speakers ('Macedonians') in Albania, while Adam Balcer offers a broad-ranging annotated catalog of the main ethnoreligious and ethnolinguistic groups that nowadays live on the territory of historical Macedonia.

The objectivizing value of the book is improved by the use of illustrative quotes in original languages (Albanian, Bulgarian, Greek, Latin, Macedonian or Serbian) rendered in their respective Cyrillic, Greek and Latin scripts, obviously with English translations promptly supplied in footnotes. However, surprisingly the same treatment is not extended to Ottomanica and Slavophone texts in Arabic letters, which in this volume occur only incidentally on the reproduction of an Ottoman map between pages 224 and 225. Given the comprehensive character of this reference-like tome, it would be of much value and help to have Albanian/Kosovan, Bulgarian and Turkish/Muslim views on Macedonianness discussed at length in separate chapters. The same is true of the non-state minorities of Roma (Gypsies) and Vlachs (Romacephones) who in various ways, but quite decisively, shaped and continue shaping various aspects of the broadly construed Macedonia. Yet, at present, the volume is the best available introduction to the broad interdisciplinary field of Macedonian studies.

TOMASZ KAMUSELLA

Stefano Bianchini, *Eastern Europe and the Challenges of Modernity, 1800–2000* (London and New York: Routledge, 2015), 288 pp.

In this book, Stefano Bianchini, Professor of East European Politics and History at the University of Bologna, presents an overview of the political ideas that emerged in “Eastern Europe” in the 19th and 20th centuries.

“Eastern Europe” here denotes the wide territory “from the Elbe to the Ural Mountains, from the Baltic to the Aegean” (p. 38), namely, Russia, East-Central Europe, and the Balkans. In recent publications, researchers tend to concentrate their academic attention on one of these regions, considering the cultural or historical differences between them. Bianchini revitalizes the concept of “Eastern Europe,” reminding us of the existence of networks of ideas and movements there even in the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century.

What was the common concern that drove intellectuals and politicians in “Eastern Europe” for the cultivation of new political ideas? Bianchini points out that it was the backwardness of this area. To compensate the misfortune of the latecomer and to achieve modernization in ways different from those of Western Europe, heated debate on modernization continued for centuries and more. One idea was the *Narodnichestvo*, which aimed to “skip” the phase of capitalism and arrive at the socialist phase by transforming the traditional collective agricultural structures in Russia. *Narodnichestvo* found its supporters in Southeast Europe. The Slavophile alternative was the Romantic cousin of the *Narodnichestvo* and its democratic and egalitarian version was supported even among the Slavs in Cisleithania.

Thanks to the revolutions during and after WWI, these “ideas” seized chances to become official policy with agendas toward modernity in each country. The agrarian politicians acquired governing power in Central-Eastern Europe between the two world wars and they formed the “Green international” for mutual cooperation. In Soviet Russia, the Bolsheviks debated the role of peasants and agriculture for the construction of an industrialized socialist society. After WWII, the whole of “Eastern Europe” chose the socialist way towards modernization, although the Central-Eastern European and Balkan countries tried to raise the question of whether there should be plural development models in socialism. A serious dividing line appeared between market socialism and state socialism after Stalin’s death.

Bianchini successfully illuminates the importance of agrarian problems in the overall modernization of Eastern Europe. Premodern features of production in the agricultural sector inspired the ideas for the new way towards socialism. Debate on agricultural structure and the necessity for revolution among Japanese socialists is rooted in a similar concern. Ideas spread far beyond the East European borders. The relationship between agriculture and capitalism was another factor. Most of the ideas premised that agriculture should be exploited and the capital gained from agriculture invested into industries. The fate of agrarianism was doomed on the road to modernity. The development of cooperatives in East-Central Europe was an exceptional way for agriculture to coexist with the market.

This bitter fate of agrarianism makes us rethink the definition of modernity in this book. What does modernity or modernization mean here? Is industrialization, the take-off from agrarian society, a goal for modernization? Bianchini takes this definition and argues that agrarianism, which highly values peasant virtue, runs into self-contradiction in the course of modernization.

Here exists one confusing point of this book. If the goal of modernization was to enter urban industrial society, the quest for modernity should have ended by the 1950s or 1960s in most parts of Eastern Europe, or even by the 1920s in some parts of East-Central Europe. Why does this book not put an end to this point? Bianchini goes on to examine the ideas after Stalin's death, in spite of the fact that market socialism, state socialism, and self-governing socialism, among which tense debate took place in the 1960s to 1980s, had goals other than mere industrialization or urbanization.

In order to understand Bianchini's endeavor consistently, it is necessary to add some consideration to the consequences of "socialist modernization." It could be presumed that socialist modernity was not "modern enough." Different models of socialist reform seek such new goals as human rights, democracy, wealthy consumer society, and sustainability of industrial development. The latter two, consumerism and environmentalism, are new issues that have emerged as a challenge for post-modern society, as Bianchini approves. Incorporating these issues into ideas for modernity seems to make the point of discussion too diffuse. The former two, human rights and democracy, if they were to be included as important elements of modernity, should have been discussed from the beginning, when the project for modernization was established in Eastern Europe in the 19th century.

In conclusion, Bianchini stresses the fact that, on 4 June 1989, two events occurred simultaneously: the massacre in Tiananmen Square and the Polish free election. Demonstrating the element of enlightenment in the narodnik movement, Bianchini concludes that the "transformation of East European society between the 19th and 21st centuries occurred within the parameters of a modern culture shared in Europe, and sealed by the events of 4 June 1989" (p. 206). This interpretation of the political ideas in Eastern Europe reminds us of the biblical story of the "Parable of the Prodigal Son." Were the political thinkers and politicians in Eastern Europe, who searched for an alternative way towards modernity, the prodigal sons who left the Western European father for several decades just to return and admit the rightness of the father's choice? How can we understand the recent political development in Russia? It is interesting to see the Hungarians and the Poles prepare for another running away from home.

To explore these unanswered questions, it is essential for us to return to the 1950s or 1960s and examine the "real-existing socialist modern society." What was achieved by socialist modernization and how was it different from modern society achieved by capitalism? This informative book leads us further to this point and it may open a new page for research on the history of Eastern Europe in the 20th century.

NAKADA-AMIYA Mizuho

Gyula Horváth, *Spaces and Places in Central and Eastern Europe* (London and New York: Routledge, 2015), 272 pp.

This book examines the specific regional development paths of Central and Eastern European countries, and evaluates the effects of the factors determining this process. The author summarizes the main points of this book under three themes: making a comparative analysis of the system of objectives, instruments and institutions of spatial development from a unified perspective (mainly in Part I); evaluating various periods of regional development of Eastern Germany, Russia, and Hungary (in Part II); and indicating a comprehensive picture of two essential factors of European territorial cohesion, that is, the role of research and development and macro-regional integration in the Central and Eastern European transition process (mainly in Part III and the conclusion).

The book is divided into three main parts and nine chapters. The chapters of Part I compare the regional development of East European countries. Chapter 1 explains the historical development and current situation of the regional disparities in these countries, and points out that the construction of new nation states from regions with different historical backgrounds, the central planning of the socialist era conducted without considering the situation of the regions, and the radical transformation of the economic structures after the regime change have created the current regional differences. Chapter 2 analyzes the development of regional policies since the regime transformation, and concludes that the regional development policies of East European countries are still underdeveloped, and that the accession to the European Union paradoxically has had a centralizing effect on these countries by giving central governments the role of making national development plans. Chapter 3, titled "Regions as frameworks of power," discusses desirable methods of decentralization of East European countries, and indicates that under the condition that regional self-governments in East European countries are still weak it would be appropriate to create a common managing body for developing peripheral, backward regions with states providing part of the financial resources for this decision-making forum. In Chapter 4, "Towards a knowledge based regional development," the author analyzes the regional distribution of research units in East European countries, and concludes that R&D institutions should be dispersed to various regions, especially in the West Balkan states.

The chapters of Part II discuss specific cases of regional development and policy, focusing on the cases of East Germany, Russia, and Hungary. Chapter 5 discusses the history of regional development of the Eastern part of Germany from the unification of the German Empire through the German Democratic Republic to the post-reunification period of Germany, and emphasizes the need to strengthen industry and R&D as two driving forces of sustainable development of the Eastern part. Chapter 6 explains the history of regional transformation of Russia from the final period of the Russian Empire through the Soviet Union to the current period, and concludes that the disparities between regions have been increasing because of the lack of a systematic regional policy during the Soviet era and the inappropriate regional policy since the destruction of the Soviet Union. Chapter 7, examining the regionalism in Hungary as an example of a unitary state, summarizes the failure to create effective regional institutions and offers opinions concerning regional development in Hungary.

Part III contains only Chapter 8, in which the author analyzes the current situation of the Carpathian Basin and emphasizes the need for “the institutionalization of the formal regionalization of this area” (p. 235).

This book is very informative and would be useful for understanding the history and the current situation of regional development and regional policies in East European countries. In particular, the chapters of Part II concisely summarize the history of over one-hundred years’ regional development of three countries, which is useful for understanding the current problems from a historical viewpoint.

There are, however, some shortcomings to this book. One is that this book is not systematically organized, and that each chapter discusses issues independently, contrary to the author’s emphasis that this book makes a comparative analysis “from a unified perspective” (p. 10). There is no systematic method of analysis or concrete methodology for the comparison, so readers of this book would have the impression that this is not a book with a systematic analysis but rather a collection of articles. The other shortcoming is that, as is seen in my summarization above, this book confuses the analysis of the situation with opinion on the regional development policies. In some chapters (especially the chapters relating to the Hungarian case) most of the parts are devoted to the opinions offered, rather than analysis of the current situation. The opinion concerning policies should be based on an analysis of the current situation, but these two things should be discussed separately. In addition, the text should be edited more carefully, as there are many spelling and punctuation errors.

SENGOKU Manabu