



Ministerstwo Nauki
i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

W ramach zadania wydawniczego Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego, dofinansowanego ze środków MNiSW (UMOWA Nr 714/P-DUN/2017), zrealizowaliśmy tłumaczenie polskojęzycznych artykułów z setnego, jubileuszowego tomu czasopisma „Lud” na język angielski.

LUD

THE JOURNAL OF THE POLISH ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY AND THE
COMMITTEE OF ETHNOLOGICAL SCIENCES OF THE POLISH ACADEMY
OF SCIENCES

VOLUME C for the Year 2016

„LUD” is regularly indexed/abstracted in:

- IBSS (International Bibliography of the Social Sciences)
- Anthropological Index Online
- CEJSH (Central European Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities)
- ERIH (European Reference Index for the Humanities); ERIH PLUS (European Reference Index for the Humanities and the Social Sciences)
- SCOPUS
- Bibliografia etnografii polskiej (<http://www.bep.uni.lodz.pl>)

LUD

THE JOURNAL OF THE POLISH ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY AND
THE COMMITTEE OF ETHNOLOGICAL SCIENCES OF THE
POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Founded in

1895

by Antoni Kalina

VOLUME C

of the General Collection
for the year 2016



POLISH ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY

COMMITTEE OF ETHNOLOGICAL SCIENCES OF THE POLISH ACADEMY OF
SCIENCES

POZNAN' - WARSZAWA – WROCLAW 2016

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Janusz Barański, Michał Buchowski, Elżbieta Goździak (Washington), Chris Hann (Halle/Saale), Zbigniew Jasiewicz, Katarzyna Kaniowska, Gabriela Kiliánová (Bratislava), Lech Mróz, Aleksander Posern-Zieliński, Alexandra Schwell (Hamburg)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Chief Editor – Danuta Penkala-Gawęcka

Associate Editor – Jacek Bednarski

Secretary – Natalia Bloch

Editor – Roman Bąk

Theme Editor (folklore) – Teresa Smolińska

Language Editor – Katarzyna Majbroda

Technical Editor – Justyna Nowaczyk

Cover design – Ewa Wąsowska

Article Reviewers:

Ewa Banasiewicz-Ossowska, Marcin Brocki, Michał Galas, Joanna Janiszewska, Zygmunt Kłodnicki, Waldemar Kuligowski, Zbigniew Libera, Jan Lorenz, Katarzyna Łeńska-Bąk, Małgorzata Melchior, Lech Mróz, Magdalena Radkowska-Walkowicz, Sławomir Sikora, Magdalena Waligórska

Proofreading of the abstracts: Samuel Bennett

Translation of the Table of contents: Małgorzata Rajtar

Copyright by Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze and Authors, 2016

ISSN 0076-1435

Volume co-publisher: The Seweryn Udziela Museum of Ethnography in Cracow

The publication is co-sponsored by:

The Institute of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań,

The Institute of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology at the University of Warsaw

The Museum of Folk Architecture in Sanok

The Ethnographic Museum in Toruń

PES Branches in Kraków, Opole, Poznań, and Warsaw;

Published in cooperation with the University of Wrocław

Polish Ethnological Society – Wrocław 2016

Administration: 50-383 WROCLAW, UL. FRYDERYKA JOLIOT-CURIE 12

Phone: 71 375 75 83, FAX 71 375 75 84

e-mail: ptl@ptl.info.pl, <http://www.ptl.info.pl>

Editor: 61-614 POZNAN, UL. UMULTOWSKA 89d

Phone: 61 829 13 64, 61 829 13 85, 61 829 13 84

e-mail: danagaw@amu.edu.pl; jbed@amu.edu.pl; nbloch@amu.edu.pl

http://www.ptl.info.pl/?page_id=112

PRINT: Zakład Poligraficzno-Wydawniczy M-Druk in Wągrowiec

THE CENTENNIAL VOLUME OF “LUD”. We invite you to read the centennial volume of the journal “LUD”. Its appearance in print (still!) was possible thanks to the generous financial support of institutions, organizations and people who responded to our request. We thank our Donors from the bottom of our hearts! It seems significant that, through this undertaking, we have in a way returned to the period of the beginnings of the journal, whose first authors and editors often had to overcome financial difficulties and search hard for money for publication. This volume is special. It contains a number of “occasional” texts discussing the history and current state of institutions that have been important and well-deserved for the development of ethnology – the Library and Archive of the Polish Ethnological Society and the Committee on Ethnological Sciences of the Polish Academy of Sciences. The core part of this issue is a special section which contains reflections of foreign scientists on the anthropological research that they have conducted in Poland. Anthropologists affiliated in academic institutions in various countries (United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Slovakia, Ukraine), both those widely-known and those only starting their scientific career, conducting various ethnographic studies in our country, have described their experiences of Polish research. They have often shared very personal memories and remarks, both on field research, meetings with Polish colleagues, as well as other aspects of “being here”. Together, they paint an interesting picture of the process of creating anthropological knowledge about Poland at different times and from different perspectives. The broad context of these interesting, deep reflections is presented in an introductory article written by Prof. Michał Buchowski, the initiator of this part of the volume. Apart from the above-mentioned sections, the usual layout of the content of the journal has been preserved. The current policy of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, aimed at ensuring open access to all scientific journals, has prompted a change in the form of publication to an on-line version. This issue of “LUD” is, perhaps, the last one published in printed form. As we announced in the appeal for support, we wanted the centennial volume to close the history of this journal, so important to Polish ethnology and anthropology, with a symbolic and material clasp, and, at the same time, to mark the beginning of its “new digital age”. I am glad that thanks to your help, this was accomplished. It is also the last and tenth volume, which I have edited as editor-in-chief since the 2007 editorial year. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Editorial Board, the editorial team, reviewers, authors, and all readers, without whose work, support, assistance, kindness and interest the magazine would have never survived and

developed. I would also like to thank for the continuous institutional and personal support on the part of the Polish Ethnological Society and the Committee on Ethnological Sciences of the Polish Academy of Sciences, whose publication “LUD” is. Below is an excerpt from the 1985 Foreward from the Editorial Board in the first volume of “LUD”, which shows how the newly created journal was thought of:

if we succeed in keeping [it] in these frames and elevating it to a level that we are held to by the science of ethnology and the benefit of the cause for which we have decided to work – we will be rewarded with a blissful feeling of having worked, to the best of our abilities, for a cause we consider important and useful.

Despite the passage of time and the change of nomenclature, our goals have remained the same. We have tried to raise the level of the journal to a degree corresponding to the contemporary demands of ethnology/socio-cultural anthropology. Even though not all of our intentions might have been realized, we can say that “to the best of our abilities”, we have worked for “a cause we consider important and useful”. The new editor-in-chief and his team are facing new requirements, and new and difficult challenges. I wish them success in meeting these challenges and enjoyment and satisfaction from work “for the benefit of the cause”.

Danuta Penkala-Gawęcka

ALEKSANDRA MICHAŁOWSKA
Jan Czekanowski Library
Polish Ethnological Society
Wrocław

LIBRARY OF THE POLISH ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY

The Library of the Main Board of the Polish Ethnological Society (PES) was founded together with the Society in 1895 in Lviv. Its creation was one of the tasks set by the founders of the Society. Information about the compilation of the collection of folk literature was published in the first volume of "Lud" (*Sprawy...* 1895: 31), and publishers and authors were asked to submit publications in the field as well as related sciences. Some of the first authors to donate their books to the library were Jan Karłowicz, Antoni Kalina, Seweryn Udziela and Henryk Strzelecki. In addition, since the first year of its existence, contacts with foreign and national institutions had been established in order to exchange publications. Among the earliest collaborations were Schlesische Gesellschaft für Volkskunde (Wrocław), Verein für Volkskunde (Berlin), Verein für österreichische Volkskunde (Vienna), Magyar Néprajzi Társaság (Budapest), Society of Friends of Science (Poznań), Tsarist Geographical Society (St. Petersburg), Narodopisne museum česko-slovenske (Prague), Bukowiner Landes-Museum (Chernivtsi), and the National Museum in Sarajevo. Issues of "Lud" were sent in return for the received publications (Gerlach-Kłodnicka, Kłodnicki 1997: 159).

Initially, the library developed primarily through gifts and exchanges; the first book purchase was probably made in 1902. Collections grew steadily and, as early as 1886, a librarian's position was created. In the first ten years of the library, the book collection was managed by Stefan Ramult, Benedykt Dybowski, Jan Cavanna, Franciszek Krček, Władysław Jankowski and Michał Siwak. In 1897, the library was made available to the members of the Society. One day a week was designated for this purpose, and after a year, it was decided that books could be borrowed by post, so that members of the Society outside of Lviv could also benefit from the collection (Gerlach-Kłodnicka, Kłodnicki 1997: 160).

In 1900, the collection increased to 1000 volumes and, therefore, a catalog and inventory were created. These works were started in 1903 when Aleksandr Medyński was assigned to help the librarian Władysław Jankowski take care of the collection. They were then replaced by

Michał Siwak and Ludwik Bernacki. Financial difficulties prevented the book collection from being shared with a wider audience (Gerlach-Kłodnicka, Kłodnicki 1997: 160).

In 1909, a cataloging device was purchased to create a card catalog. In the meantime, the library was first moved to the Tadeusz Kosciuszko school, and in 1906, a decision was made to rent a space for the collection. In 1913, due to financial difficulties, the rent was abandoned and the collections were placed in Dr. Adam Fischer's apartment. Thanks to Prof. Jan Czekanowski, still in the same year, a room at the Institute of Anthropology of the University of Lviv was made available to the Society, where the book collection and the Society's own publications were deposited. The last library relocation in Lviv took place in 1925. This time, the book collection was transferred to the Ethnological Department of Jan Kazimierz University. They remained there until 1939. During this period, the collection expanded mainly thanks to exchange with many domestic and foreign institutions (in 1934 - 62 domestic, 152 foreign). Moreover, the library received copies of "Lud" from the Editors (Gerlach-Kłodnicka, Kłodnicki 1997: 161).

During the Second World War, the library was under the threat of destruction and changed its headquarters and several times. It owes its survival mainly to Fischer, who put much effort into rescuing it, and after his death (in 1943), to his wife, Olga and his son, Władysław. After the war, with the decision of Jan Czekanowski and Józef Gajek, the Society's headquarters, which adopted the name of the Polish Ethnological Society, was moved to Lublin. The archival and library collections, which were initially located in Fischer's flat in Gliwice, were transported there with some difficulty in 1946. As part of the book collection was lost during the war, it was supplemented by collections from post-German libraries, and also by purchasing books that Fischer had left after his passing. PES has remained in Lublin until the end of 1951. At the beginning of the following year, the Society was moved briefly to Poznań, where it stayed until 1953, when another relocation took place, this time to Wrocław (Gerlach-Kłodnicka, Kłodnicki 1997: 161-162; Suchecka 2001: 70). In the capital of Lower Silesia, thanks to the hospitality of the University of Wrocław, the Society received rooms located at 4 Biskupa Nankiera Square. The librarian Anna Łyszcz-Wirpszowa became the new keeper of the collection, a position she held until 1963. In 1962, Helena Kopeć was admitted to the library, while in 1964 – Zygmunt Kłodnicki. However, he moved to the Department of General and Slavic Ethnography at the

University of Wrocław, and his position was taken by a graduate of ethnography, Jadwiga Gerlach-Kłodnicka (Gerlach-Kłodnicka, Kłodnicki 1997: 162).

In 1965, in order to commemorate Prof. Czekanowski, the library was given his name. Three years later, the Society received new premises from the University of Wrocław – on the ground floor at 36 Szewska Street. The library was made available to the readers one year later. At the end of 1971, the library was included in the library network of the Polish Academy of Sciences. Also at that time, cooperation with the National Library was started, which included the exchange of catalogs of major foreign journals and works of literature (Gerlach-Kłodnicka, Kłodnicki 1997: 162).

In 1975, Jadwiga Balon, who completed post-secondary vocational library training, was hired at the library and worked there until 1992. In 1977, Helena Kopeć, MA, left the library and Jadwiga Gerlach-Kłodnicka, MA, became its director. In 1984, she was joined by Paulina Suchecka, MA (Gerlach-Kłodnicka, Kłodnicki 1997: 163).

Until 1991 the library functioned mainly thanks to the subsidies of the Polish Academy of Sciences, which in 1992, however, stopped supporting all scientific societies. Therefore, it was necessary to reorganize the financial side of the library's activity. In the same year, funds were raised by applying for subsidies to the Scientific Research Committee (Rostworowska 1993: 295), and in later years, to the Ministry of Science and Information Technology, which was finally transformed into the Ministry of Science and Higher Education.

In 2001, in connection with the general renovation of the tenement house at 36 Szewska Street, the library collection was temporarily transferred to the library building of the Faculty of Social Sciences at Koszarowa Street. The new rooms, which were smaller and lower, did not allow for the assemblage of shelves and unpacking of all the collections. Therefore, some of the collections were not available until moving to a permanent location. The return of the library to the old location was impossible, and there was a need to leave the facility at Koszarowa Street. The proposal of the University of Wrocław was to place PES's collection in the new building of its Main Library, whose construction was to begin in 2001. In the meantime, the Society was offered rooms at the premises of the primary school at 48a Kuźnicza Street, which the University had recently taken over. However, PES rejected the offer, as the premises were not fully adapted

to store library collections, and the costs of adaptation proved too high. The building of the Faculty of Dentistry at Cieszyńskiego Street was also considered for relocation, however, for a number of reasons, the idea was not realized. Finally, in 2004, the collections were moved to a building at Szczytnicka Street that had been recently taken over by the University from the Wrocław City Hall. The move took place in August 2004. PES received three classrooms for storage of the library, a reading room and an office, a large corridor and sanitary facilities for the staff – all on the second floor. The total area was about 230 m². For safety reasons, i.e., to prevent the collapsing of ceilings, the shelves could only be put in designated areas and only up to 170 cm (Adamczewski 2005: 351-352). The collection has been completely unpacked and available to the public since April 2005.

The relations between PES and Wrocław University were formalized in an agreement on cooperation and provision of library services signed in 2003. It was signed for a year and renewed twice: in 2004 and 2005. The following year the agreement was renewed for three years, under the conditions established at the beginning.

Paulina Suchecka, MA, became the new head of the library in 2004, while Bożena Wrońska became the new steward of the library collections. In the years 2002-2004, Mrs. Kłodnicka was still working in the PES library under a mandatory agreement and was responsible for the exchange of publications (Adamczewski 2005: 350). In 2006, Aleksandra Michałowska, a graduate of Library and Information Science at Wrocław University, was employed.

The ongoing development of electronic catalogs in Poland led PES to purchase a package of MAK and MAKWWW programs. The software, acquired in 2007 from the National Library, was intended to catalog non-periodical publications. In the same year, the introduction of book descriptions into the program began. In 2010, the MAK system was made available via the internet. The links to the database can be found on the PES website (www.ptl.info.pl) and on the Main Library page of the University of Wrocław. By the end of 2010, a computer and card catalog (alphabetical and factual: thematic and ethno-geographic, prepared by J. Kłodnicka) were run simultaneously. At the beginning of 2011, the card catalog was closed.

In March 2009, after the expiry of the agreement with the University of Wrocław, which began in 2006, talks were started on the further functioning of the library within the University.

Consequently, on 28 September 2009, a contract of lending for use was signed for a period of five years, whereby the book collection, while remaining the property of PES, was incorporated into the structure of the University Library and placed in the group of specialized libraries of the University. The University has committed to covering the costs of maintaining the library. For the needs of the contract, it was necessary to make a complete inventory of the collections, the first comprehensive one since 1945. A committee appointed by the director of the University Library conducted the control from October 2009 to April 2010 (Adamczewski 2010: 477-478). For the duration of the agreement between the institutions, the PES Library librarian, Ms. Michałowska, MA, was employed by the University of Wrocław. Her task was still to work for the PES Library, but in addition, she had to report to the Main Library and attend the meetings of the specialized libraries at the University. In September 2014, the contract was renewed for another five years.

The headquarters at Szczytnicka Street also turned out to be temporary. Due to the sale of the building in which the library, office and the magazine were located by the University of Wrocław, PES faced the necessity of leaving the premises. The decision to move was made in 2013, and in the beginning of 2014, successive packing of the books began, which made it difficult for the public to access it regularly. Again, the Society was offered to move to the new building of the University's Main Library, whose construction had been completed several years earlier. This location, very favorable for potential readers and conducive to cooperation with the Main Library, was unanimously approved by the Central Board of PES. The University allocated rooms with a separate entrance for the library's use – two units with a total area of 249 m², located on the ground floor in the commercial part of the building. The move took place from May 20 to 28, 2015, and was fully funded by PES. It was necessary to rent a transport company which, apart from the transport of the library, archives and offices, also dealt with the disassembling and assembling of shelving. Library collections were made available to readers at the beginning of July 2015.

By the end of 2015, Polish and foreign non-periodical publications that were added to the library in the years 1986-2015 were published in the MAK catalog. In order to spread information about the collections to the widest possible audience, they were added to the computer catalog of the University's Library in the Virtua system. As a result, PES book

collections will also be available in the NUKAT and WorldCat catalogs. The University Library has committed to train PES staff (Ms. Michałowska) in cataloging in the new system, and since the beginning of 2016, all new acquisitions have been cataloged in Virtui. A gradual cataloging of older publications is also planned.

In February 2015, PES signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the University Library for the development of the University's Digital Library. This was followed by the creation of a separate collection for the PES archival and library collections at the University's Digital Library. The University Library provided training for employees and support for its Reprographic and Digitization Laboratory in the digitization of the collections. The first materials to be uploaded to the Digital Library's website came from the PES Archive. It was the legacy of Prof. Stanisław Poniatowski – it was digitized and published online thanks to the project *Utworzenie repozytorium cyfrowego: dokumenty i fotografie Stanisława Poniatowskiego (1884-1945)*¹. The project, financed by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education within the framework of the National Program for the Development of the Humanities, under the direction of Dr. Stefania Skowron-Markowska, allowed for the creation of a professional digitization workshop, and therefore, opened the way for to the digitization of its archival and library resources for the Society. Still in 2016, some of the oldest collections in the PES library will be uploaded to the University's Digital Library. The scanning of Polish and foreign titles that are not available in other digital libraries is planned. This is the beginning of many years of digitization of PES collections. Being engaged in the development of the University's Digital Library, the PES Library participates in the international cooperation of scientific libraries in the field of maintenance, development and provision of library resources in electronic form. In addition, PES collections available in the Digital Library will be searchable through the Digital Libraries Federation portal and Europeana – European Digital Library, which will make them accessible to interested parties from all over the world.

The collection currently numbers around 45 thousand volumes, and its value is approximately 430 thousand Polish Zlotys. The collection is growing steadily (by about 600 volumes annually). The new acquisitions are invariably obtained as exchanges, purchases and donations. The exchange is conducted with about 125 foreign and 45 domestic institutions. Polish

¹ Eng. Creation of a digital repository: documents and photographs by Stanisław Poniatowski (1884-1945)

and foreign journals (almost inaccessible in other libraries in Poland) are mainly acquired in this way, as well as low-volume specialist publications. In addition, since the beginning of the 1990s, the library has received regular donations to buy books. At first, the development of PES's collection was supported by the Scientific Research Committee, and then, by the Ministry of Science and Information Technology, today the Ministry of Science and Higher Education. Thanks to the financial support under the "Popularization and Promotion of Science" program that the library receives, every year, new collections of publications appearing in Poland and abroad are acquired. As a result, the book collection has retained its specialized profile and readers are guaranteed access to current scientific achievements in ethnology and cultural anthropology, as well as related fields.

REFERENCES

- Adamczewski J.
 2005 *Sprawozdanie z działalności Zarządu Głównego Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego w latach 2002-2005*, „Lud” 89, pp. 349-359.
- 2010 *Sprawozdanie z działalności Zarządu Głównego Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego za okres od września 2009 do sierpnia 2010*, „Lud” 94, pp. 476-484.
- Gerlach-Kłodnicka J., Kłodnicki Z.
 1997 *Biblioteka przy Zarządzie Głównym Towarzystwa*, in: Z. Kłodnicki (ed.), *Kronika Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego (1895-1995)*, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze, pp. 159-163.
- Rostworowska M.
 1993 *Sprawozdanie z działalności Zarządu Głównego Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego za okres od września 1992 do września roku 1993*, „Lud” 76, pp. 295-299.
- Sprawy...*
 1895 *Sprawy Towarzystwa*, „Lud” 1, pp. 29-32.
- Suchecka P.
 2001 *Korespondencja Adama Fischera w zbiorach Archiwum Naukowego Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego*, w: Z. Jasiewicz, T. Karwiczka (eds), *Przeszłość etnologii polskiej w jej teraźniejszości*, Poznań: Komitet Nauk Etnologicznych PAN, pp. 71-78.

MAREK SZAJDA
Institute of History
University of Wrocław

SCIENTIFIC ARCHIVE OF THE POLISH ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY'S EXECUTIVE BOARD. RESOURCES, FUNCTIONING AND TASKS FOR THE FUTURE¹

The triple jubilee of the Polish Ethnological Society prompted the author to write an article on the Society's activities in the field of publishing, namely, to what extent and in which areas were archival sources used in PES publications; to what extent were postulates made at General Assemblies implemented; and to what extent can the published work contribute to the reconstruction of the development of the historical process of folk culture in light of today's methodology (Sobisiak 1955: 1).

So begins a text written years ago by Walerian Sobisiak, later professor of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, entitled *Zagadnienie źródeł archiwalnych w pracach Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego*². This is probably the only publication on this subject in the collection of the Scientific Archive of the Executive Board of the Polish Ethnological Society (PES)³. The article, written sixty years ago, was probably inspired by the sixtieth anniversary of the Society of ethnographers.

This article discusses the the Archive's resources and its use from a twice-as-long perspective of time. I present the SA resources, their acquisition and use over the past decades of its operation. I also try to answer the question what archival materials and the institution of the archives itself are today for modern anthropologists and ethnologists. The reason for writing this article is not only the jubilee of the Society, but above all, the need for an overall discussion of SA activities and its valuable collections. The information given can thus be treated as either contributing to the creation of an inventory guide, as well as perceptions regarding the activity of the institution and its utility in the scientific and extra-scientific environment.

¹ This article is the result of an internship, which I completed had in the PES Scientific Archive between October and December 2015.

² Eng. The issue of archival sources in the work of the Polish Ethnological Society.

³ From this point on, the Scientific Archive will be referred to as SA.

A short talk about the SA's long history

In many cases, the beginnings of the functioning of different organizations are not thoroughly described. They rely heavily on conjectures or fragmented archival materials, which usually do not provide the dates and names of the founders sought for by historians. SA's fate seems all too familiar. The reasons are the lack of accurate data, including the documents that could provide valuable information about the founding of the institution and its first years of existence. The oldest mention of the origins of the Archive is information about the employment of a writer who was supposed to "deal with clerical tasks", found in the minutes of the Main Board's meeting (*Sprawozdanie...* 1896: 93). It is thanks to his work that completed cases could be archived after a particular time had passed. On this basis, under the Ethnological Society, probably already in its early years, a departmental archive was run. Currently, the documents that have been produced in the first decades of the Society's functioning are one of the most interesting fonds stored in the SA (Ref. no. 496).

Prof. Adam Fischer, Ethnological Society's long-time secretary and editor of "Lud" is generally considered to be the founder of the institution (Gajkowska 1967: 25; Suchecka 1997: 163). Hence, it can be concluded that the Archives were created in the period before World War I, perhaps around 1911 or in subsequent years. This would imply that materials considered important to ethnologists have been stored in the Archive for more than one-hundred years. Regardless of the date of establishment of the institution, from its beginning to this day, SA is connected to the functioning of the Polish Ethnological Society's Library. Therefore, the history of the organization, which moved from Lviv to other cities already after 1945, also affected the history of the archival collections. Unfortunately, in many cases the effect was not positive, especially considering the shape that some of the materials are in, as well as their completeness.

The only article so far to deal with the issue of the Archives as a whole is a text written by Paulina Suchecka and published in the chronicle devoted to the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of PES (Suchecka 1997). In it, the author distinguishes four periods of the institution's activity. This division is based on the Archive's location, i.e., the cities where the headquarters of the organization, and more importantly the library, were in. Suchecka lists the following periods: Lviv, Lublin, Poznań, and Wrocław, with the latter continuing to this day. The above frames can be assigned a corresponding chronology. The first stage lasted until the end of World War II. At

the time, the Society's headquarters was moved to Lublin, where since July 1944, the most important Polish political and social institutions were located. Poznań became SA's home only for a transitional period between 1951-1952. As a result of a conflict between Prof. Józef Gajek and Prof. Eugeniusz Frankowski, the former took the whole collection with him to Wrocław. Since 1953, the SA has been located in the capital of Lower Silesia. Its headquarters were (in the following order) the buildings at Biskupa Nankiera Square, Szewska Street, Koszarowa Street, and currently Fryderyka Joliot-Curie Street, where the PES Library is also located. During this whole time, the Archive has not been granted separate and specially adapted rooms, designed strictly for the storage and sharing of materials. The archival materials are made available for viewing in the library's reading room.

In this context, it is worth mentioning the unique, 11th volume of the Ethnographic Archive, devoted solely to the SA and edited by Zofia Staszczak (1955). It contains a list of the contents of the Scientific Archive, comprising over one thousand items with reference numbers from the manuscript and typography section. All materials from the years 1945-1955 are listed in the alphabetical order of names, which constitutes all of the resources at the time. This small publication is of valuable archival assistance still today.

Resources of the Scientific Archives

The pre-war period, i.e. the Fischer period

The above-mentioned brief history primarily concerns events of an institutional nature. The changing of headquarters resulted from clear historical, political or simply economic conditions. The history of the materials gathered in the unit is quite different. Looking at the history of their acquisition, I propose a different historical division. From this point of view, the first period deserves to be named after Prof. Fischer. It is precisely the outstanding activity of Adam Fischer that began a whole new chapter in the history of PES (Simonides 2015). The Archive owes him just as much, as this is currently where a large part his work is held. Chronologically, the discussed period lasted from the beginning of the Archive's existence until the Second World War. In those years, thanks to Prof. Fischer, not only was the SA established, but also documents which dealt with the functioning of the Society in the first decades of its activity were deposited there. After all, many of the documents were produced by the professor himself.

Among the discussed materials is quite a rich correspondence with outstanding scientists of the period. Paulina Suchecka discussed them in a separate article (Suchecka 2001). In it, the author mentions the valuable exchange of letters between Jan Stanisław Bystróż (Ref. no. 517), Cezaria Ehrenkreutz-Jędrzejewiczowa (Ref. no. 518) or Seweryn Udziela (Ref. no. 529), and the then editor of "Lud". Many of these letters also come from pre-WWII national and local institutions and from the editorial offices of various magazines. Among other archival materials are numerous notes from field research, responses to surveys, articles and papers. It should be noted that the work of the Lviv ethnographer comprises almost 150 references, which constitutes a large part of the entire Archive. Importantly, these materials, although they were created by Fischer and relate to the period before 1945, were acquired by the SA only after the war. This was made possible by the cooperation of ethnographers, mainly Józef Gajka, with the professor's family, who took his work with them when they were resettled from Lviv to Gliwice. Later, still during the Lublin period of PES, these materials were transferred to the Archive. Information on this subject is also included in several post-war letters that make up part of the collection (Ref. no. 519).

The materials produced before the war also include the notable archives of Prof. Stanisław Poniąkowski, a researcher of Siberia, among other regions. Dozens of reference numbers testify to a fairly sizable collection, which was enriched by another dozen files of different content and volume already after the war (and the ethnographer's death). Prof. Fischer's as well as Prof. Poniąkowski's legacies⁴, if one can identify them as such⁵, are not only some of the most important materials stored in the SA, but also the largest fonds. What is noteworthy is that, for years, they have not been developed or accurately recorded. Currently, thanks to a research grant under the framework of the National Program for the Development of the Humanities, the Poniąkowski collections have been separated from the archival inventory (Skowron-Markowska 2014: 171-176). The digitization of the documents was finished in June 2016. As a result, all of the materials of the Warsaw ethnographer were moved to the Library of

⁴ I understand the term legacy to mean materials that have been produced by a person, or are in some way connected to them (e.g. because of research interests), and which have been incorporated into one collection.

⁵ In fact, they are not a separate collection.

the University of Wrocław⁶, A separate archive was created for the project and new reference numbers were given. It should be added that the development of part of the materials connected to Poniatowski was started already almost ten years ago. PES commissioned the development of the Old-Polish documents collected by Prof. Poniatowski to Dr. Agnieszka Knychalska, who took part in his research. Her study discussing the content of the archival material (Knychalska 2008) is available to readers on the Society's website.

Prof. Fischer's Collection, although it has not been developed fully, is also of interest to researchers. Currently, Dr. Monika Kujawska, based on the archival material, mainly surveys on plants, is executing a project financed from a National Science Center grant⁷. The purpose of the project is to create a dictionary of beliefs, based on the documentation collected by Fischer over the years (Kujawska, Łuczaj, Typek 2015). Perhaps these activities will result in a detailed elaboration of the materials and their separation from the Archives into a separate collection, or rather, Fischer's legacy.

According to the inventory of the archival team, by 1939, 493 positions were collected, and assigned sequential ordering numbers. These were later transformed into particular reference numbers. Importantly, individual documents sometimes contain only a few pages. Some, however, are even a few-hundred-pages long, as exemplified by "Etnografia Rusinów", part. I-III (ref. no. 30), or "Etnografia Prus", part. I-IV (ref. no. 41), written by Fischer.

Among the interesting works of the pre-war (or Fischer) period, there are also works by other prominent ethnographers. We can find among them several works by Seweryn Udziela, for example, "Z kronik kościelnych" (ref. no. 173), a dozen or so texts by Henryk Biegeleisen, "Wróżby i przepowiednie w zwyczajach" (ref. no. 180), among others, or four documents written by Jan Kubary. There are also noteworthy questionnaires and surveys from field research carried out before the war. A dozen or so reference numbers are linked to Oskar Kolberg's materials and related studies. Much of his legacy was moved to Poznań in 1961 on the request of Józef Gajek⁸. In addition, several studies of lesser known ethnographers, such as Wincenty Badura can be found in the archives.

⁶ Some of the materials are now available at: www.bibliotekacyfrowa.pl/dlibra/collectiondescription?dirids=198 (01.09.2016).

⁷ More information about the project can be found on the Polish Ethnological Society's website: http://www.ptl.info.pl/?page_id=4316 (01.09.2016).

⁸ Some of Kolberg's works have been added to the SA's inventory years ago. They are in fact the property of Oskar Kolberg's Institute in Poznań, which is where they are stored.

Józef Gajek's impact on the development of the Scientific Archive

The breakout of World War II stopped the archivization of important materials. Only a few years after the termination of military action were valuable materials admitted to the SA again. The first collections were added to the inventory in 1947, but the systematic acquisitions were only recorded two years later. It was then that a new period in the history of the Polish Ethnological Society began. The end of the 1940's is probably the most dynamic period in the functioning of the Archive, as evidenced by the materials that were acquired. It can be attributed to a large extent to Józef Gajek, a student of Adam Fischer. Within a few decades, Prof. Gajek performed various functions in the organization, being both the president as well as the secretary general for over ten years. His academic activities were closely linked to the postwar work of PES. First, he worked in Lublin for a few years, and later in Poznań for a short period. Finally, in 1953, he was employed at the University of Wrocław. Along with him, the library and archival resources were moved to the city on the Oder River.

Gajek led the editorial work of "Lud" for over 20 years and thanks to his activity, the SA was expanded substantially. Each of the submitted articles, even if it was not finally published, was archived. The articles still constitute an extraordinary archival collection that awaits proper ordering and development. Besides many materials of a strictly scientific nature, such as articles, reviews, chronicle texts and manuscripts of books prepared for publication, under the dozens of reference numbers, one can find reports from the activities of PES branches, ethnographic museums from all over Poland, speeches and texts by Gajek himself, letters to PES (including personal ones), and many other documents.

Particularly noteworthy are materials collected for the first volumes of the *Atlas Polskich Strojów Ludowych*⁹ (ref. no. 942 and higher) and materials collected for the development of the *Polski atlas etnograficzny*¹⁰, of which the professor was an editor for many years, and which appears in the inventory from 1951 onwards. Luckily, many of the documents connected to scientific work at the university have also been maintained. Surveys prepared for ethnographic studies in the 1950s, and reports from them (mostly prepared by students at that time), may be an

⁹ Eng. Atlas of Polish Folk Costumes.

¹⁰ Eng. Polish ethnographic atlas.

interesting material for comparative studies today. Understandably, most of them concern the area of Lower Silesia, only occasionally do materials from other regions of the country appear.

It is worth mentioning that in this period, the Archive obtained a lot of materials by foreign authors. Among them are German ethnographers and researchers from other countries of Central and Eastern Europe, belonging to “People’s democracy” states (Soviet Bloc) of the time. For example, reviews and reports on the achievements of Soviet ethnographers and new books from behind the eastern border appeared systematically.

Looking at this post-war collection, primarily in the first ten years, it is impossible not to notice that most of the works of this period have a strong political subtext, from the flagship articles on the tasks of Marxist ethnography, written by Gajek, to the numerous reports on PES’s activity from particular years, where newspeak and calls for fulfilling work standards are not unusual. Part of the work, understandably also pertains to the so called Recovered Territories or rather Western Territories, whose Piast character was being artificially proven¹¹.

With the beginning of the 1960s, the number of materials entered into the inventory decreased. The year 1965 is, according to the references and inventory book, most likely the last year in this period, in which new acquisitions were made by the SA. Perhaps a new inventory was created in the following years, or new materials were acquired without being listed in the archival resource list. Many of them, still from the period of the Polish People’s Republic, are waiting to be developed, properly assigned, and given a reference number.

Sybirak collections

The end of the 1980s is another breakthrough moment in the functioning of the archives, and hence, the next period worth distinguishing based on the materials obtained. In January 1988, the editors of “Literatura Ludowa”, headed by Prof. Czesław Hernas, together with Antoni Kuczyński, announced a contest for personal accounts of deportations and exiles to Siberia. In response, 343 works of varying volume, some even several-hundred-pages long, were submitted. Additional documents were sent in together with them, mainly photographs from the time of exile, including ID photographs of Members of the Polish Patriotic Association. In 1991,

¹¹ Piast refers to the first dynasty of Polish rulers which ended with the death of Casimir III in 1370. The term is often used to denote ‘purely’ Polish heritage - Z.B.

the winners of the contest were selected, and the main awards and distinctions were awarded. Despite the fact that materials were no longer accepted after the winners had been announced, the acquisition of memoirs was continued. In the following years, mostly in the 1990s, but also in the 21st century, reference numbers of personal accounts of Sybiraks were added to the inventory. Currently, the collection numbers over one-thousand file numbers, and each year, about a dozen or so new accounts are acquired.

The fact that this collection has grown almost three times in the course of two decades can be attributed primarily to Prof. Kuczyński. Thanks to his activity, many materials were sent to Wrocław not only from Poland, but also from members of the Polish diaspora in other parts of the world, including Australia and Oceania. Much credit should also be given to the Sybiraks themselves, who presented with the opportunity, decided to summarize their exile fate, and send their written memoirs to the SA. Among some interesting cases are ones where it was not individuals, but local Sybirak Associations that gathered valuable documents and records, thanks the collective effort of their members.

It is worth noting that many of the SA's patrons do not use its strictly ethnological resources, but primarily the resources containing personal accounts of deportations. A number of books and scientific articles (Kość-Ryżko 2008; Ciesielski 1996, 1997; Ciesielski, Hryciuk, Srebrakowski 2004) as well as master's theses have been written based on them. Especially in recent years, when a strong emphasis has been put on the analysis of experience, memory and narration in anthropology, this part of the Society's Archive has become extremely attractive.

Currently, the collection of memoirs is the best-developed part of the SA. Initially, patrons had at their disposal a bibliographical catalogue of the contest entries, which was prepared by Paulina Suchecka in 1991¹². With the influx of subsequent materials in the second half of the 1990s, Małgorzata Ruchniewicz, D.Litt., PhD, from University of Wrocław, took care of the collection. She has successively compiled a list of the new parts, creating something of an annotated bibliography or "commented bibliography", as she called it (Ruchniewicz 2015a, 2015b). Currently, under the "Archive" tab on the Society's website, one can find a list of the stored memoirs in alphabetical order with a description and summary of each of them¹³. One can

¹² The bibliography of the contest entries is still available for SA patrons.

¹³ See: http://www.ptl.info.pl/?page_id=39 (29.01.2016).

also find there an article by Ruchniewicz, which describes the creation and functioning of the whole collection in detail.

In addition to the above-mentioned resources, based on which I have identified the particular periods, there is another, separate collection, listed in a different inventory book. It is an archival collection of “plates and films”, in the past referred to as section III, of which a large part are photographs. It comes from various periods of the Society’s activity. Currently, the list contains 4752 archival records. However, these materials are dispersed and incomplete, therefore the inventory itself is now a testament to what once used to be part of the SA, and which today is rather difficult to call a separate collection.

In the end, it is worth mentioning the latest acquisition – the legacy of Dr. Jan Piotr Dekowski, which was transferred to the SA and is currently waiting to be developed and made available to the public. This collection includes materials concerning folk costumes, food and annual rituals, mainly from Central Poland.

The current state and challenges faced by the Scientific Archive

Over the past decades, the Scientific Archive has amassed more than just individual documents. Each year, the institution has hosted different readers, both academics and people who are curious of the world, who wrote articles and books based on the information they found. Since 1964, the SA has run an attendance record. Initially there were not many entries in it. In the first year, you can only find eight of them, 18 in the following year, a similar number in 1967 – 17, while in 1970, the smallest number in history – only five readers. The archive was visited the most in the 1990s, due to a high interest in memoirs concerning deportation. In 1996, there were 116 entries, while in the following year even more – 208 – the largest number in the history of recorded attendance and sharing of resources.

The staff of the Archive is not to be left out of this discussion. Interestingly, in the long history of this institution, there were few full-time employees. For most of the time, the Archive was curated by librarians that were employed full-time by the PES Library. This stemmed from a symbiosis that was formed between the two institutions, especially since it was moved to Wrocław. Initially, however, while still in Poznań, the Archive was taken very seriously. In Volume 39 of “Lud”, published in 1952, there is an interesting report on the organization of the

Archive. At the time, two people oversaw the recording and describing of the materials: Maria Walewska and Jerzy Grocholski (*Sprawozdanie...* 1952: 536). Such a situation did not repeat itself in the following years, although the number of resources at the SA was growing. It is in this period that the instructions on the development of archival ethnographic resources were created (currently ref. no. 976), which the hired ethnographers probably created for their own needs.

In 1961, the PES Main Board established the position of archivist. The idea behind it was for the employee¹⁴ to create a directory of resources, which PES wanted to publish as a separate publication (*Sprawozdanie...* 1965: 638). Unfortunately, because of the employee's failure to complete the task, the publication was never released. In the following year, from June to September, Janusz Bohdanowicz was responsible for developing the collection, and from October probably to the end of December – Jan Heidenreich. As a result of their work, part of the collections were organized.

Over two decades later, the interest in the Archive intensified once again. In the Main Board's activity report for the period between September 1983 and the end of August 1984, not only was a need for hiring an employee for the Archive declared, but a vision of the work in the institution was also drawn:

By optimizing work on the physical catalog, a graduate of Ethnography at the University of Wrocław was hired in the position of junior librarian. She is also responsible for the development of the Scientific Archive of PES. The organization of the Scientific Archive is an urgent matter, because it contains unique materials concerning the history of the Society, invaluable manuscripts of many famous scholars and travelers – people who really mean a lot in the history of Polish folklore, ethnography and anthropology. Systematic organizational, scientific and maintenance work is planned in this regard (*Sprawozdanie...* 1985: 381).

Paulina Suchecka, who was hired at the time, has been managing the Archive to this day. This is one of the many responsibilities of the PES Library Manager, which also include the coordination of the acquisition of library collections, managing finances, publishing responsibilities, grants, and others. Nevertheless, it is in these past three decades that the Archive has acquired the Sybirak collection and has started work on the digitization of part of its

¹⁴ His details were not given in the Report.

resources. A lot of work in this field, however, remains to be completed in the future. Importantly, in 1984, already after the ethnographer had been employed, the only inventory in the history of the Archive was carried out. As a result, it turned out that many materials can no longer be found in their designated locations under the ascribed reference numbers. Most likely, an indeterminate part of the Archive was taken from it in earlier years, or was moved to other files, or incorrect locations, which are now difficult to find.

Each archive, regardless of its size and character, has designated primary goals and tasks. Some of them are general, and others are more detailed, depending on the collection and the capabilities of the employees as well as the financial resources. These include collecting, securing and merging of the materials, and organizing, developing, storing and sharing of the collections (Strykowski 2015: 13). In many archives, the number of tasks is a lot higher and includes, among others, the organization of sessions, popular scientific lectures, exhibitions and scientific research work, e.g., the execution of on demand inquiries. All of the above primary objectives should also be included in the mission statements of private and departmental archives, as well as those run by various types of associations.

As I have already written, many of these tasks were completed in the SA, some however, quite superficially. It would be recommended that not only ethnographers, but also PES members, start a discussion about the future of the institution as well as its goals for the coming years. I would include among the most important ones the development of archival materials, (including their description) ordering of the materials, and the carrying out of an inventory. As part of this work, the separation of particular archival resources, collections, and legacies should be considered. Separate archival categories can be attributed to collections of famous ethnographers without any problem, similarly to the correspondence and important documents concerning the activity of the Society. Furthermore, materials from the first postwar years could create a new, interesting collection. Such a development of the resources would not only introduce order, but most importantly, it would also facilitate the use of the archives for future patrons. It would also be worth creating a small, but complete resource guide (Laszuk 2015). The majority of State Archives have such guides.

At present, many cultural initiatives face financial barriers. This issue is also worth thinking through in the context of the Archive's functioning. Is it better to find grants for smaller

archive-related projects? Or is it more practical to find a small, but permanent source of financing, which could ensure systematic development of the archives?

After all, the SA has to deal with the problems that are currently affecting most archival facilities. Progressive digitization, in a way enforces the digitization of archival documents as well as the development of digital archives lists. Another issue related to the widespread computerization is the acquisition of materials. If the institution is to continue to fulfil this function, it must be prepared to receive digital content – not just photos or other visual files, but also interviews from the field and other such documents. This, however, requires the creation of new rules for the storage, development and sharing of such archival materials with the public.

In the past 100 years, anthropology has changed, but not to the extent that archival materials should be treated as a relic of the previous era. There are currently interesting works prepared on the basis of archival materials. A good example is an article by Inga Kuźma (Kuźma 2013), or the articles based on the Sybirak narratives mentioned above. Therefore, the Scientific Archive is still needed, which certainly does not need to be asserted. However, in order to be able to use it comfortably in the coming years, appropriate organizational work should be undertaken already now. Perhaps, those researchers who would like to transfer their scientific achievements to the Archive in the future should especially make sure of this.

REFERENCES

- Ciesielski S.
1996 *Praca polskich zesłańców w Kazachstanie (1940-1945)*, in: S. Ciesielski, A. Kuczyński (eds), *Polacy w Kazachstanie. Historia i współczesność*, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, pp. 329-354.
- 1997 *Polacy w Kazachstanie 1940-1946. Zesłańcy lat wojny*, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo „W Kolorach Tęczy”.
- Ciesielski S., Hryciuk G., Srebrakowski A.
2004 *Masowe deportacje ludności w Związku Radzieckim*, Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Gajkowska O.
1967 *Historia Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego. Jego powstanie, rozwój i znaczenie w ciągu siedemdziesięciolecia*, „Lud” 51: 1, pp. 25-26.
- Knychalska A.
2008 *Dokumenty staropolskie z Archiwum Prof. Stanisława Poniatowskiego*, www.ptl.info.pl/?page_id=39 (01.09.2016).
- Kość-Ryżko K.
2008 *Żywi we wspomnieniach. Doświadczenia życia i śmierci w relacjach*

- polskich zesłańców w ZSRR (w latach 1940-1946)*, Wrocław: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze.
- 2013 *Doświadczenie wywózki i życia na zesłaniu w relacjach Polaków wywiezionych z Kresów w latach 1940-1941*, „Studia BAS” 34: 2, pp. 25-49.
- Kujawska M., Łuczaj Ł., Typek J.
2015 *Fischer's Lexicon of Slavic Beliefs and Customs: A Previously Unknown Contribution to the Ethnobotany of Ukraine and Poland*, „Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine” 11 (85), pp. 4-6.
- Kuźma I.
2013 *Łodzianki a Rewolucja 1905 r. – migawki z naukowego archiwum etnograficznego*, „Władza Sądzenia” 2, pp. 25-43.
- Laszuk A.
2015 *Zasób polskich archiwów państwowych publikowany w przewodnikach*, in: J.R. Sielezin (ed.), *W kręgu historii i archiwistyki. Księga jubileuszowa ofiarowana Czesławowi Margasowi w dziewięćdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, Jelenia Góra: Ad Rem, pp. 55-64.
- Ruchniewicz M.
2015a *Wspomnienia Sybiraków – bibliografia komentowana zbiorów Archiwum Naukowego przy Zarządzie Głównym Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego we Wrocławiu*, www.ptl.info.pl/?page_id=39 (29.01.2016).
- 2015b *Wspomnienia Sybiraków. Z zasobów Archiwum Naukowego przy Zarządzie Głównym Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego we Wrocławiu*, www.ptl.info.pl/?page_id=39 (29.01.2016).
- Simonides D.
2015 *Miejsce Adama Fischera w historii polskiej folklorystyki*, in: P. Grochowski, A. Mianeki (eds), *Adam Fischer*, Toruń, Wrocław: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze, pp. 23-44.
- Skowron-Markowska S.
2014 *Digitalizacja kolekcji materiałów Stanisława Poniatowskiego ze zbiorów Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego (Oddział we Wrocławiu)*, „Etnografia Nowa” 6, 171-176.
- Sobisiak W.
1955 *Zagadnienie źródeł archiwalnych w pracach Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego*, materiały z Archiwum Naukowego przy Zarządzie Głównym PTL, file no. 746.
- Sprawozdanie...*
1896 *Sprawozdanie z posiedzenia Zarządu Głównego*, „Lud” 2, p. 93.
1952 *Sprawozdanie z prac nad uporządkowaniem archiwum Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego*, „Lud” 39, p. 536.
1965 *Sprawozdanie Zarządu Głównego*, „Lud” 47, p. 638.
1985 *Sprawozdanie z działalności Zarządu Głównego Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego za okres od 1 września 1983 do 1 września 1984 r.*, „Lud” 69, p. 381.
- Staszczak Z.

- 1955 *Wykaz zawartości Archiwum Naukowego Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego*, Wrocław: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze.
- Strykowski K.
2015 *O starych i nowych funkcjach archiwów*, in: I. Mamczak-Gadkowska, K. Strykowski (eds), *Nowe funkcje archiwów*, Poznań: Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, pp. 11-20.
- Suchecka P.
1997 *Archiwum naukowe*, w: Z. Kłodnicki (ed.), *Kronika Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego (1895-1995)*, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, pp. 163-166.
- 2001 *Korespondencja Adama Fischera w zbiorach Archiwum Naukowego Polskiego Towarzystwa Ludoznawczego*, in: Z. Jasiewicz, T. Karwicka (eds), *Przeszłość etnologii polskiej w jej teraźniejszości*, Poznań: Komitet Nauk Etnologicznych PAN, pp. 71-78.

Internet sources:

Biblioteka Cyfrowa Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego,
www.bibliotekacyfrowa.pl/dlibra/collectiondescription?dirids=198 (01.09.2016).
Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze, www.ptl.info.pl/?page_id=4316 (01.09.2016).

Zbigniew Jasiewicz, Aleksander Posern-Zieliński
Institute of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

ETHNOLOGY IN THE POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

REFLECTIONS UPON THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDATION OF THE PAS COMMITTEE ON ETHNOLOGICAL SCIENCES

In 2015, the Committee on Ethnological Sciences of the Polish Academy of Sciences (PAS) in its plenary session, convened in the new seat of the Institute of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. It celebrated the 40th anniversary of the foundation of this important institution representing ethnologists, anthropologists, folklorists and representatives of related fields with a commemorative reflection. However, the roots of the presence of ethnologists in the formal structures of PAS committees go much farther back in time than the mid-1970s. This confirms a rather difficult path that the ethnological community had to go through to be fully recognized¹.

The Committee on Ethnological Sciences, which has been working for 40 years now, expresses the will of the ethnological and socio-cultural anthropological communities' to have a common representation, as well as a platform for coordinating some of the activities between different academic centers and research specializations. These types of pursuits were noticeable already in the quite distant past. It is worth mentioning the establishment of the Ethnological Section at the Academy of Learning already in 1873, thus, much earlier than the foundation of the Chair of Ethnology at the University of Lviv in 1910. However, during the Partition period, in spite of the effort made, their attempts were doomed to failure. Favorable conditions for establishing an institutional representation of the discipline appeared only after Poland regained its independence after 1918. During this period, the Ethnological Society gradually expanded the range of its work to new lands. However, the need for a more professional representation of

¹In addition to published materials, the authors have referred to not only their own memory from the time of their work for the Committee, but also the archives located in the Committee's Secretariat at its headquarters in Poznań, at the Institute of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology of Adam Mickiewicz University.

ethnologists was also recognized at the time. Hence, the Polish Ethnological Society² was created in 1921 with Prof. Jan Czekanowski as its president and Prof. Eugeniusz Frankowski as secretary general and the actual originator of the idea. Unfortunately, the initiative proved to be short-lived and rather inefficient.

After the Second World War, the Ethnological Society strengthened its position, and in 1947 it assumed its current name – Polish Ethnological Society (PES). Meetings of professors of ethnography were organized beyond this social forum in order to discuss important tasks related to the further development of the discipline. During these meetings, an assessment of the current state of ethnography was prepared in 1951 in preparation of the forthcoming 1st Congress of Polish Science, which was to establish the Polish Academy of Sciences. Within this new structure, the Department of Ethnography as well as the Scientific Council (which included outstanding ethnographers, also from outside of PAS) gained nationwide importance. The Department functioned within the Institute of History of Material Culture at PAS. One must admit that these new structures clearly reduced the distance between the particular institutions that existed in the inter-war period, which made it difficult for professors to cooperate. New leaders began to emerge from the ethnological milieu, which was being reestablished after WW II. One of the first of them was undoubtedly Prof. Józef Gajek (from Wrocław), the secretary and chairman of PES between 1945 and 1967. Later, Prof. Witold Dynowski (from Warsaw) and Prof. Kazimierz Moszyński (from Cracow) also played an important role in the process of unifying national initiatives in the field ethnography and ethnology. In the 1970's, Prof. Józef Burszta, a new leader in the ethnological milieu who was associated with the Poznań university, played an important reformative and initiating role.

The first initiatives aimed at empowering the representation of ethnology within PAS committees, go back to the turn of the 1950s and 1960s, when a fairly ephemeral Ethnographic Commission was created under the Committee for Historical Studies. Such structural positioning was connected to the perception of ethnography as an auxiliary science of History at the time.

² The Polish Ethnological Society mentioned here is called *Polskie Towarzystwo Etnologiczne* in Polish. Although the current organization, *Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze* translates into English in the same way, the two societies are not synonymous.

At the beginning of the 1970s, the idea of forming a similar commission was introduced, this time under the Committee of Sociological Sciences of PAS, as there were already six ethnologists in its structures (out of 51 members). This idea was undoubtedly associated with Prof. Burszta's initiatives to make ethnography a social science. As a result, in May 1972, thanks to a significant contribution of the Polish Ethnological Society, as the only body representing the whole ethnographic community at the time, an Ethnography Section was established, headed by Prof. Burszta. His deputies were professors Maria Frankowska and Anna Kutrzeba-Pojnarowa, while Zbigniew Jasiewicz, associate professor at that time, was its secretary. In total, the section numbered eighteen people representing all academic centers that were important to ethnology. From this date onward, Adam Mickiewicz University's Chair of Ethnography (today, the Institute of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology) in Poznań became the headquarters of the Section, and later of the Standing Committee. From the very beginning, the Section represented diverse ethnographic communities, i.e., university chairs, the Polish Ethnological Society, PAS research institutes, folklore research centres, centers dealing with folk art, ethnographic museums and related fields (rural sociology). The first tasks of the newly formed Section concerned the preparation of the ethnological community for the Second Congress of Polish Culture and included the development of expert opinions concerning the current state of ethnography. Under the auspices of this body, the 2nd International Conference of Slavic Ethnographers in Blaziejewek near Poznań was also organized in 1974 (Burszta 1975).

That same year, just two years after the establishment of the Section, the idea of transforming the group into an independent committee started to materialize. The first proposals to move in this direction were formulated by Prof. Burszta in June 1974, in a speech given at the PAS's Faculty I, entitled "Etnografia Polska: osiągnięcia – organizacja – perspektywy"³. The atmosphere, then favorable to this idea at the Faculty I (social sciences) of PAS, led by professors Władysław Markiewicz and Marian Wojciechowski, made it possible to take further steps and send a memorial to PES (November 1974). The memorial, "On the need to establish an Ethnographic Sciences Committee" was authored by Prof. Burszta. The document pointed to the significant dispersion of the activity of Polish ethnographers, which was not conducive to the coordination of research and organization of joint ventures. One of the steps on the way to

³ Eng. Polish ethnography: achievements – organization – perspectives

overcome these difficulties was supposed to be a separate committee, that would better integrate and strengthen Polish ethnography as an independent scientific field.

It should be noted that the efforts to have a separate committee were fully justified in the period of the Polish People's Republic. At the time, there was a tendency for a high degree of centralization of science, and those disciplines that had their committees in the structures of PAS, inevitably occupied an important position. Their committees were treated as centers capable of coordinating scientific activities across the country. In the early 1970s, however, there was not a favorable environment in the ethnological community for creating this type of representation. The period of dominance of great figures, true patriarchs of Polish ethnography who had previously shaped the discipline, was over. They died or they had ceased to be fully active as scholars, e.g., Moszyński (died in 1959), Frankowski (died in 1962), Gajek (died in 1987) and Dobrowolski (died in 1987). In the years of their scholarly activity, because of their strong personalities, different research interests and academic positions, they were not particularly inclined to cooperate and would often close themselves in their centers.

In turn, Prof. Burszta, who was striving to set up the committee, was at that time thought of as a newcomer in the ethnological milieu, coming from beyond the current system, who did not fully conform to the traditional model of a professor. Yet, it turned out that it was he who definitely strove for an integrated representation of the whole community. His personal qualities helped him in his efforts to create the committee: great industriousness, kindness to people, pragmatism and the ability to create and direct research teams. Prof. Burszta was able to convince sociologists, with whom he had good contacts, to create an Ethnographic Section within their Committee. He was also the one to seek the support of the authorities of Faculty I of PAS, then headed by archaeologist Prof. Witold Hensel, for the transformation of the Section into an independent committee. He was also supported in his endeavors by some professors and the younger generation of ethnographers.

As a result of these both official and personal operations, on March 27, 1975, The Committee on Ethnographic Sciences (CES) was established within the Polish Academy of Sciences. Its first term lasted until 1977. The inaugural meeting of CES was held in Warsaw on April 19th. Twenty-nine members were appointed to the Committee, and the number later was enlarged to thirty-two people. The membership was thus similar in number to the current limits.

Already in June of the same year, PAS approved the amendment of the name of the Committee to one more consistent with European traditions. Since then, the Committee has functioned as the Committee on Ethnological Sciences. It was headed again by Prof. Burszta, and his deputies were Professors Bronisława Kopczyńska-Jaworska and Zofia Sokolewicz, while the duties of the secretary were continued to be performed by Prof. Jasiewicz. The first tasks of the newly appointed Committee included the development of expert opinions on the staffing situation and current state of research. Moreover, long-term documentation and bibliography work was initiated in cooperation with the Polish Ethnological Society (PES). Apart from these tasks, the Committee's mandate also included “caring” for the training of personnel and ethnographic programs, and the support of all organizational initiatives supporting the development of ethnology and related sciences (folklore, ethnomusicology, museum ethnography, ethnic religious studies) (Burszta 1978a).

The first term of the CES was devoted primarily to the development of an internal structure of the Committee, so that different research teams could effectively function within this scholarly framework. As a result, six specialist committees and teams were formed. These were: The Commission for the Study of Folk Culture in the Carpathians, headed by Prof. Mieczysław Gładysz and located in Cracow, The Commission of Religious Ethnology, under the supervision of associate professor Henryk Swienko (in Warsaw); The Commission of Research in Contemporary Culture (also in Warsaw), whose head was Prof. Maria Biernacka, and the American Studies Commission, based in Poznań, and headed by Prof. Maria Frankowska. The status of ‘team’ was given to: the Research Team for the Study of Traditional Fisheries, founded by Prof. Maria Znamierowska-Prüffer from Toruń, and the Research Team for Scientific Ethnographic Documentation, located in Łódź and initiated by Prof. Kopczyńska-Jaworska. The structure reflected above all the interests of the leading professors of the Polish Academy of Sciences at the time, as well as specializations developed in individual scientific centers. These units were supposed to intensify research through organizing conferences, supporting research projects, developing expert opinions and preparing publications. An important element contributing to the activation of the teams and commissions, was their extended composition, which included not only the members of the Committee, but also the co-opted specialists of the younger generation. Therefore, the Committee's activities quickly became visible and important to the whole Polish ethnological community, creating an integrated platform for cooperation.

The last year of the Committee's first term (1977) is worth noting, as at that time CES started intensive efforts to establish a separate ethnological institute in Poland that was to operate under PAS. At that time, the only strictly research-focused institution in this field was the Department of Ethnology that functioned within the interdisciplinary Institute of Material History of the Polish Academy of Sciences, in which archaeologists actually dominated. Therefore, the goal was to raise the importance of ethnology as an independent discipline and to create, based on the above-mentioned Department, a strong scientific institution with perspectives for development. The project for such an institute, developed by Prof. Burszta, also envisaged the inclusion of scattered research teams that dealt with folk music, folk literature, folk art, folk heritage, and publishing (specifically of The Complete Works of Oskar Kolberg), as well as scientific information and documentation. This idea was in line with the current tendencies in Polish science favoring the centralization of research activities in the “leading” centers functioning within the Polish Academy of Sciences. It was believed that such a strong institution would contribute significantly to the further development of ethnology as a science important for “shaping a modern national culture.” Also, in other “countries of People’s Democracy” and in the USSR, ethnological (ethnographic) institutes had been operating successfully for years, so the establishment of such an institution in Poland was a logical fulfillment of existing horizons (Burszta 1978b).

However, these well-supported goals were not met with the support of the authorities, especially that the end of the 1970s was marked by symptoms of a recession, and the following decade of great socio-political turbulence and growing stagnation forced the community to abandon this ambitious project. Its realization was not helped by the significant differences of opinion among ethnologists regarding the conception and structure of the future institute. This historical sketch of the efforts to create the ethnological institute reflects the highly dynamic efforts of the ethnological community, which in a relatively short period of time, was able to transform the modest Ethnographic Section into the Committee on Ethnological Sciences, which functions until today, and which was going to create its own institute soon after.

The further history of the Committee is certainly a topic for a separate article, in which the history of the activity of this representation of ethnologists would be shown against the background of the meanders of the development of ethnology, inscribed in the difficult history of

the end of the Polish People's Republic, the period of transformation from Communism to Capitalism, and the building of the Third Republic (Posern-Zieliński 1991)⁴. Instead of venturing upon another journey into the past, it is worthwhile, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Committee, to give attention to the importance that the PAS Committee on Ethnological Sciences has had for the disciplines that it manages.

Firstly, CES created a space that fostered the integration of ethnological sciences in three important areas: personal, institutional and interdisciplinary. The members of the ethnological milieu met regularly at the meetings of the Committee and its commissions, they participated in the elections to these bodies, they visited the various ethnological centers and got acquainted with their achievements, and convened conferences and seminars; they also undertook joint initiatives, often combining the activities of several scientific institutions. The Committee has cooperated, and continues to do so, with the Polish Ethnological Society, and the journal “Lud”, published annually, has become an expression of the cooperation between both of these social institutions. The Committee has also been interested in the activity and development of ethnographic museums, as has supported and cooperated with many other institutions and academic associations, including the Polish Institute of Anthropology and the Oskar Kolberg Institute. Finally, last but not least, it brought ethnologists and anthropologists closer together with the representatives of related disciplines: literary scholars with interests in folklore, sociologists dealing with social anthropology, ethnomusicologists and ethnohistorians.

Secondly, the Committee strengthened the importance of ethnology in the academic structure of Polish science, emphasizing its status as an independent discipline, free from subordination to Sociology or History. Having their own Committee, for the first time Ethnologists became full-fledged partners of the representatives of other social sciences and the humanities centered at the Polish Academy of Sciences. Largely thanks to the Committee, after many years of absence of ethnologists among PAS members (after the deaths of Prof. Moszyński and Dobrowolski), it was possible to introduce a representative of our community (Prof. Aleksander Posern-Zieliński) into this prestigious body. Moreover, several ethnologists active in CES (Prof. Sokolewicz, Posern-Zieliński and Lech Mróz), have also become members of the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences.

⁴ Since 1992, in “Lud”, regular reports on the activities of the Committee, its plenary meetings and elections of new members and authorities.

Thirdly, the Committee has borne witness to the transformations of ethnology and has co-created the conditions for its development. It has participated in its evolutionary modernization from within, and has sought for its scientific “promotion”, so that it could become an important and regarded discipline in the mainstream of the social sciences and humanities. It should be recalled that, as post-war “ethnography”, it was marginalized, and through administrative decisions, it was categorized as an auxiliary science, and thus had limited independence. However, it should be added that, in order to keep its autonomy and the ethos of its folk interests, it sheltered itself in the safe niche of the study of European folk culture and so-called primordial societies living in overseas worlds. This traditional, firmly rooted in the nineteenth century approach, started to undergo significant transformations in the 1970s and 1980s. It gradually modernized all aspects of its scientific activity, starting with structural reforms, through widening its theoretical horizons and improving its methods of fieldwork and analytical work, to gaining more methodological competence and widening its interest to include new research fields. The Committee and its members also played an important role in these joint modernization efforts – from an ethnography firmly rooted in the tradition of folk studies, to a modern ethnology that became closer and closer to socio-cultural anthropology, and focused primarily on important manifestations of contemporary life. It organized debates and discussions, convened conferences and meetings, prepared memorials and expert reports. In the words it always encouraged the whole community of ethnological sciences to make further efforts in order to make ethnology/anthropology an important and attractive discipline that is able to join mainstream debates about culture, nation and society.

Fourth, the Committee was undoubtedly a protective shield and an instrument responding to crises threatening the position of ethnology, as well as its individual centers. Among many such interventions, it is worthwhile to recall the battle in the early 1990s against the implementation of the resolution of the Main Board of Higher Education, which proposed the dissolution of separate study programs in ethnology and transforming them into specializations within History programs. The then President of the Committee (Prof. Jasiewicz), together with representatives of other threatened fields (archeologists and art historians), effectively intervened in this matter in the Ministry of Higher Education, and as a result, the extremely detrimental amendment of the regulations was stopped, and ethnology still remains a separate, so-called unique, field of study.

Fifth, the Committee has made formal contacts with international scientific organizations possible, the Committee on Ethnological Sciences, through the Polish Academy of Sciences, has become a member of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, the most important global ethnological organization. Each Chairperson of the Committee automatically becomes PAS's representative in this global association.

Last, the Committee has also expanded the publishing possibilities of the community, by publishing a series entitled "The work of the PAS Committee on Ethnological Sciences" (Pol. Prace Komitetu Nauk Etnologicznych PAN). Within this series, four volumes of the much needed *Bibliography of Polish Ethnography* (Pol. Bibliografia etnografii polskiej), as well as the so-called congressional volumes, published in English on the occasion of successive congresses of the International Symposium of the Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, in order to popularize the work of Polish scholars abroad.

The authors of the above reflections are convinced that the Committee has been in the last four decades an important ethnological institution, both in terms of the internal affairs of the community, and in the necessary relations within the social sciences and humanities coordinated by PAS. It is obvious that our comments and evaluations in this sketch are partly subjective, because we have been involved in directing the work of the Committee for many years, acting in it in turn as secretaries of science, and then as its chairs⁵. The framework of this message has made it possible for us to point to only some, in our view most important, aspects of the Committee's activities, emphasizing their importance for the whole ethnological community. Of course, we are aware of the limited role of organizational structures and activities for the development of science, which is created primarily by outstanding individuals and their particular accomplishments. Institutional frameworks can in some cases inhibit development, and in others, promote scientific initiatives and foster research. In this case, however, we are convinced that the PAS Committee on Ethnological Sciences of the Polish Academy of Sciences, established forty years ago on the initiative of Prof. Burszta, was very helpful to ethnological sciences in our country.

⁵ Prof. Jasiewicz is an honorary head of the Committee, and Prof. Posern-Zieliński is the head of CEN PAS in the current term.

REFERENCES

Burszta J.

1975 *Sekcja Etnografii i Komitetu Nauk Socjologicznych Polskiej Akademii Nauk*, „Lud” 59, pp. 290-291.

1978a *Etnografia polska w 25-lecie Polskiej Akademii Nauk*, „Lud” 62, pp. 3-11.

1978b *Establishment of the Committee for Ethnological Sciences at the Polish Academy of Sciences*, „Ethnologia Polona” 4 [print: 1979], pp. 203-205.

Posern-Zieliński A.

1991 *Działalność Komitetu Nauk Etnologicznych PAN w latach 1987-1990*, „Lud” 74 [print: 1992], pp. 295-298.

Katarzyna Majbroda
Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology
University of Wrocław

THE POSTMODERN OPENING IN POLISH SOCIO-CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY. A PROJECT REALISED?

Preliminary remarks

The main part of the discussion here pertains to postmodernism “in Polish”, although it is obvious that at least until the mid-1990s, the native discipline has shaped its internally differentiated character in the process of an accelerated reception of theories and concepts formulated in world anthropology even two decades before that. A new anthropological thought, emerging on the basis of philosophical and humanistic reflection, developed mainly by representatives of new intellectual currents from the United States, England and France, reached the Polish academic circles through translations, private readings and library inquiries abroad. In the following text, however, I consider what postmodernism meant for world anthropology. Recently, this topic was taken up by Michał Mokrzan in the article *Odpowiedź na pytanie, czy kiedykolwiek byliśmy postmodernistami?* (2014)¹. In it, he analyzes first and foremost the classic publications mainly from western anthropology, which have already been discussed on several occasions (see Kaniowska 1999a; Kuligowski 2001; Lubaś 2003; W. Burszta 2004; Brocki 2008; Majbroda 2011). Thus, references to the findings and breakthroughs in the development of this school in Europe and the United States appear in my considerations only incidentally, i.e. wherever it seems necessary from the point of view of the narrative.

The postmodern reflection undertaken gradually by Polish ethnologists was closely connected to the widely discussed crisis of representation and reflections on the literary turn of the discipline. It prompted anthropologists to look critically not only at works created by them,

¹ Eng. An answer to the question: Have we ever been postmodernists? The title of this text refers to an article by Czesław Robotycki, entitled *Antropologia kultury w Polsce – projekt urzeczywistniony* [Eng. The Anthropology of culture in Poland – a project made real] (Robotycki 1995a, which appeared in the jubilee volume of “Lud”, published in 1995 on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the magazine and the Polish Ethnological Society. Today, two decades later, we formulate some other questions in the discipline, however, the article referred to attests that the diagnoses of socio-cultural anthropology are inevitably aging, but at the same time, in an underexposed and insufficient way.

but above all, the understanding and methods of defining the anthropological research practices, as well as the status of related knowledge. There is no place to discuss the debates about the course and consequences of the literary turn in anthropology; I write about this process more extensively in other publications (Majbroda 2011, 2014a, 2015a).

Bearing in mind the history of the changes taking place in the discipline, one could say that its postmodern opening did not occur in the beginning of the 1990s as a *novum* deprived of roots. However, it was also not a direct continuation of the movements developed in Polish ethnology in the 20th century. It is worth recalling that many epistemological assumptions, which are usually attributed to postmodern inspirations in science, have far-reaching origins; for example, cognitive relativism, the issue of cultural translation, or the concepts of dialogism and heteroglossia. In these initial observations, I am trying to state that postmodernism, understood as a condition of socio-cultural reality (Lyotard 1997a), but also as the general context for currents emerging from the criticism of negatively valued modernism, has sharpened and named earlier intuitions and trends that could be regarded as postmodern. Accepting that assumption that “[postmodern is something that remains in a *verwindend* relationship with modernism: it is what it accepts from and undertakes modernity, carrying with it her traces (...). Postmodern carries modernism on, but it distorts it]” (Vattimo 1997: 136)². Such understood postmodernism, is not “[modernism at the end of its life, but at the moment of birth, which is constantly repeated]” (Lyotard 1997b: 58).

When choosing this topic, it is worthwhile to refer to Dan Sperber’s concept of the “epidemiology of representations” (1985), to reflect on what conditions have inhibited the postmodern opening of Polish Ethnology in the 1970s and 1980s, which resulted in that only at the brink of the 1990s, we can observe an increasing interest in this style of thinking. A clear difficulty with its acceptance at the threshold of transformation could be explained by the assumption that, the implementation and acceptance of a particular worldview, current of thought, philosophy (all these terms do not exhaust the existing attempts at the diagnosis of postmodernism) in the space of science, is decided by the functionality of the totality of its research practice, as well as the actual social and cultural demand, and not its artificially created forms, for example, saturating anthropological texts with traces betraying its postmodern origin.

² All translations from source languages other than English are mine – Z.B.

Familiar and postmodern at the same time?

In the 1980s, Western postmodern thought, which clearly constituted a breakthrough in global scholarship, rarely appeared in Polish sciences. Commentators of intellectual life in socialist Poland emphasize, however, that science's gaze was directed toward the West, and that taking up ideas and concepts developed in "other theoretical spaces" constituted an ersatz of freedom. As Jolanta Brach-Czaina writes about the humanities in the days before the transformation: "Keeping up to date with the latest intellectual trends and fashions, in those days in Poland meant something more than just the ordinary, professional duty of scientists and intellectuals" (Brach-Czaina 1995: 348). Despite recognizing in the Western currents an antidote for the increasingly burdensome socialism, the Polish ethnological community experienced Western anthropology gradually, which was connected with the opening of borders, the emergence of international organizations such as the Société Internationale d'Ethnologie et Folklore (SIEF), as well as the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA), founded in 1989, of which representatives of the Polish ethnological community became members (Jasiewicz 2002: 70-73). At the same time, a slow but systematic process of exporting domestic ethnological/anthropological reflection to the West was taking place (cf. Buchowski 2008, 2012).

It is difficult to resist the impression that the diagnoses made with regard to the cognitive situation shaped in the discipline on the wave of poststructuralism, but also, paradoxically, in the context of "post-ethnography", can sometimes also be applied to the terms "postmodernism" or "postmodern anthropology". Early postmodernist reflections of the 1960s and 1970s were not met with particular interest in Polish ethnology, as it was based in structuralist, phenomenological and hermeneutical theories and concepts. Zofia Sokolewicz recalls this period in the history of the discipline in the following way:

If it was a revolution, it should be called a crawling one. It started in the 1970s. It took more than one generation to make its effects, which were far from the original intentions of the creators anyway, result in a new canon, a change of questions and research procedures, as well as cognitive assumptions about the nature of the reality studied (Sokolewicz 2010: 15).

Anthropologist Michał Buchowski, offers a similar reflection, in which he draws attention to the slow departure of Polish ethnologists from a traditional model of doing science, emphasizing "the process of forming dissociative groups against the modernist model began

relatively late and was initially very slow. It seemed that ethnographers had resisted novel theoretical models the longest” (Buchowski 1995: 42).

However, when looking at the changes that were taking in the discipline at the time, one can risk the statement that Ethnology was experiencing a “homely postmodernism” at the time. In other words, Polish Ethnology’s striving for independence can be seen as post-modernist, or anti-modernist action, even though the “post” achieved by it was to be considered too hermetic and scientific (in the pejorative sense of the term) a decade later. This, in turn, created more and more intense attempts at overthrowing it.

The gradual transition from a “traditional ethnography” to ethnology in the 1980s, became to be known as a moment of the formation of a distinct ethnological current in the history of the discipline, often seen in the context of the current rebellion of the young, referred to as “young Polish Ethnology” (Buchowski 1995: 47-48; Jasiewicz 2002: 69). The category of “postmodernism” was not yet recognized and “did not function” neither in the thinking or at the level of research practice. Moreover, as Robotycki recalled, the current attempts at crossing the boundaries of traditional ethnography were received “quite sourly and with disbelief” by the community (Robotycki 1995a: 227). The phenomenological fascination of Zygmunt Benedyktowicz, Wiesław Szpilka, Dariusz Czaja, and the interest in structuralism and semiotics of Ludwik Stomma, Robotycki, Ryszard Tomicki and Jerzy S. Wasilewski arose largely from the negation of a traditional way of understanding and practicing ethnography. This was manifested in new research questions and the pursuit of thus-far unexplored theories. To some extent, the ethnology of the 1980s and 1990s developed on the basis of the exhaustion of the explanatory possibilities of traditional ethnography. It was cultivated in Poznań by Michał Buchowski and Wojciech Burszta, and developed under the influence of Jerzy Kmita’s socio-regulatory conception of culture (Buchowski 1990, Buchowski, W. Burszta 1992). Although the word postmodernism does not appear in the publications of the above-mentioned anthropologists of this period, it is hard not to notice that their methodological reflections on the philosophical contexts of interpretation are close to those developed at the time in Western anthropology, practiced already with a postmodernist consciousness. After several years, out of this approach developed an interest in the border between anthropology and literature (see W. Burszta 1996, 2015), as well as cultural criticism, postcolonialism, post-socialism, capitalism and neo-liberal

reality (see Buchowski 1996, 2001). The above mentioned anthropologist, Czesław Robotycki, has referred to this period in an interesting way, drawing a map of research interests of the current ethnological community in the following way:

Anthropological interpretation in Polish ethnography has taken the form of individual research options, thanks to the simultaneous emergence of different theoretical paradigms, which enabled the view of culture from different points of view. The newly posed questions about the essence of culture and the ways in which it was investigated, questioned, in its first step, a realistic model of science. Anthropology applied different ways of interpreting culture (Robotycki 1995a: 228).

As we know, as a result of paradigm-forming activities these orientations were, firstly, to override the traditional model of practicing the discipline; and secondly, they fulfilled the function of periodical, monopolistic stabilizers of institutional science, giving direction to research, and fostering their concentration within newly-formed schools in Polish ethnology. The above-mentioned ethnological currents were therefore “post-modernist” in their critique of the modernist model of doing research, and their diversity corresponded to a postmodern approval of polyphony in the discipline. However, the research that was carried out and the publications that were published clearly prove that the 1980s and 1990s, and the following decade in the history of discipline, were a period of very theoretical, sometimes even hermetic analyses, which did not have much in common with the postmodern opening of anthropology, characterized, among other things, by a critical gesture of rejecting grand narratives that strived to work out conclusive solutions. Nevertheless, it was at this time that analyses re-interpreting and demythologizing the “traditional peasant culture” and the similarly traditional modus of its research appeared. Waldemar Kuligowski perceives the process as an expression of native anthropology coping with its own ideological context. He writes:

The heritage of Kolberg, Dolega Chodakowski and Szulczewski, later strengthened by the ideology of the Polish People's Republic, had researchers flounder in the less and less attractive topic of rurality and repeat certain formulas ad nauseam, which have finally become, as is common with such practices, naturalized. The efforts of a number of ethnologists were needed (Burszta senior exposed the ideology of folklore, Stomma criticized the canonical image of the 19th century country, Węglarz and Robotycki pointed to the mechanisms of mythologizing folk culture) to transcend the cursed and

self-renewing sphere of the short-lived world of *praesens ethnographicum* (Kuligowski 2003: 225-226).

The focus of ethnologists was then concentrated on the analysis of ethnographic texts, whose critical, post-modernist reading has brought a disillusion with the ethnographic version of the description of culture, it showed its axiological background, its positivist (already devalued at the time) variant of rationalism, as well as the dissonance between ethnological explanations at the level of theoretical assumptions and empirical research. This diagnosis is shared by Robotycki, in his description of the atmosphere in the ethnological community, in which the anthropological opening was already taking place. As he wrote, “critically oriented anthropologists, through appropriate analyses of ethnographic texts, create an anthropology of ethnography, reluctantly accepted by those who were not capable of self-irony” (Robotycki 1995a: 233).

The critical and revindicative attitude of part of the ethnological environment resulted both from an internal evolution of the discipline, as well as its inspiration with the direction of changes and trends observed in science globally. Sokolewicz's memories make it clear that even in the 1970s, access to important anthropological publications opening the way to new ways of cognition was limited, and the only journal in the field that allowed Polish ethnologists to discern among Western theories and research practices was “Current Anthropology”, published by Sol Tax since 1963. However, even this journal was not known and read in all ethnological centers in Poland (Sokolewicz 2010: 25). It focused on the most important debates that were being had in Western anthropological communities, focusing on the intensified practice that could be described as an ethnography of ethnography. On the basis of the intensive analysis of the condition of the discipline, questions were asked about a paradigm shift in the field, the assessment of the achievements of positivist methodology, and locating anthropology on the border of science and art. Moreover, the status of empirical data and fieldwork, as well as objectivism and inter-subjectivism in anthropological cognition were problematized (Tokarska-Bakir 1990: 3).

In Polish anthropology, these questions were to appear later in meta-theoretical and self-reflective publications, which constituted critical analyses of the disciplines cognitive possibilities, as well as its leading discourses after the transformations in the 1980s and 1990s.

These publications include: Katarzyna Kaniowska's *Opis. Klucz rozumienia kultury*³ (1999b); Wojciech Burszta's *Czytanie kultury. Pięć szkiców*⁴ (1996); *Różnorodność i tożsamość. Antropologia jako kulturowa refleksyjność*⁵ (2004); Waldemar Kuligowski's *Antropologia refleksyjna. O rzeczywistości tekstu*⁶ (2001); Michał Buchowski's *Zrozumieć Innego. Antropologia racjonalności*⁷ (2004); Dariusz Czaja' *Sygnatura i fragment. Narracje antropologiczne*⁸ (2004), *Znaki szczególne. Antropologia jako ćwiczenie duchowe*⁹ (2013); Marcin Brocki's *Antropologia – literature – dialog – przekład*¹⁰ (2008); as well as the work of other representatives of the discipline, who recognized the importance of redefining anthropology's identity and diagnose its condition beyond the positivistic paradigm of science, against the backdrop of representation, and first and foremost, in the course of anthropology's struggles with the legitimacy of knowledge produced within it. In this process, the closure of traditional Polish ethnography took place.

The transformational opening

Some commentators connect the emergence of postmodernism in Polish humanities with the intellectual breath of the year 1989 and the subsequent years of the opening of science to the so far poorly recognized currents and directions, which were already settled in the West for several decades (Jasiewicz 2006: 32-33, Buchowski 2012: 32-33). The transformation of the political system was conducive to the absorption of the concepts and theories developed in the West by Polish anthropology, which was largely a result of increasingly available, read and translated publications. In 1986, a book by George Marcus and Michael Fischer, *Anthropology as Cultural Critique* was published. A year later, Stephen Tyler released *The Unspeakable. Discourse, Dialogue, and Rhetoric in the Postmodern World*, and Bob Scholte's article, "The Literary Turn in Contemporary Anthropology" (Scholte 1987), was published in *Critique of Anthropology*. In 1989, only two copies of James Clifford's book *The Predicament of Culture. Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* existed in the Polish ethnological

³ Eng. Description. The key to understanding culture.

⁴ Eng. Reading culture. Five Sketches.

⁵ Eng. Diversity and identity. Anthropology as cultural reflex.

⁶ Reflexive Anthropology. On the Reality of the Text.

⁷ Eng. Understanding the Other. Anthropology of rationality.

⁸ Eng. Signature and fragment. Anthropological narrations.

⁹ Eng. Special Characters. Anthropology as a Spiritual Exercise.

¹⁰ Eng. Anthropology – literature –dialogue – translation.

community – one in Warsaw and the other in Cracow (Sokolewicz 2010: 25). Soon its translated excerpts began to appear in the journal “Konteksty Polskiej Sztuki Ludowej”, which undoubtedly contributed to the popularization of the new anthropological thought in Poland. These publications, step by step, revealed not only the blurring of genres of scientific texts, but also the variety of ways of practicing anthropology. With their reception, there was a growing awareness in the discipline of the limits to the research and descriptiveness of socio-cultural reality.

The latter of these issues underwent a thorough reflection on the wave of the reception of the book *Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Clifford, Marcus, eds., 1986). The analysis of contexts in which references to this book have appeared in Polish anthropological publications, clearly shows that it was read primarily in the context of reflexivity, as an important voice in the dispute over the shape of the critique of knowledge (Sokolewicz 2011: 348, see Lubaś 2014: 39-65); as a clear exposition of the poetics of anthropological texts, their stylistics, rhetoric, genres, which started to be considered not only in terms of philological concepts, but also as carriers of specific perspectives and worldviews (Kuligowski 2001: 15, 2015: 38; Rakowski 2009: 23). Therefore, the book was ascribed an important role in the orientation of anthropology to “self-criticism”, “self-description”, and “meta-anthropology” (Majbroda 2014b). There were also critical voices in the Polish community, arguing that the book did not offer a revolutionary breakthrough, neither to world nor Polish anthropology (Brocki 2014: 29-37).

Criticism of the anthropological discourses and research practices opened the way for undermining unsustainable, negatively valorized scientific styles of investigating reality and the patterns of knowledge that determined them. In search of new inspirations, the anthropology of the time also turned to philosophy, being in a way its practical test (Kaniowska 1995: 62). All these changes took place on the wave of the reception of subsequent publications, sealing the literary, textual and self-reflexive anthropological turn.

Postmodernism made in Poland

The postmodern opening of Polish ethnology began at the beginning of the 1990s, and was intertwined with its increasingly pronounced anthropologization. The process of adopting

“proper” postmodernism had at least two stages: it seems that the first phase of getting acquainted with this phenomenon consisted primarily in the reception of Western publications devoted to this topic and an attempt at popularizing them in the Polish scientific community. The second stage of gradual acquaintance with postmodernism took the form of negotiations between the Western current and the native realms, according to the recognition that “good knowledge of the original works of the authors of new currents in world ethnology and anthropology is the basis for creating positive research alternatives and critically acclaimed domestic achievements” (Robotycki 1995a: 229).

The second, more difficult to implement, but also cognitively more interesting stage of the struggles with the postmodern undertaking, Polish ethnology – slowly evolving into anthropology – began to see the need to break the monoparadigmatism of the discipline, which for many decades, was manifested in concentration on folk culture and traditional ethnographic methods. Subsequently, the communicative model of culture, developed in the structuralist and semiotic current of post-ethnography, was gradually abandoned. They began to be perceived as exhausted and less inspirational approaches to the Polish anthropological community; they were deprived of a theory of practice in Pierre Bourdieu’s approach.

The impact of postmodernism on Polish ethnology tended to be perceived as a driving force responsible for the emergence of a “new paradigm” that revealed the current problems of the humanities and social sciences (Sokolewicz 2010: 29, Kaniowska 1995, 1999a). It was as if it was the answer to the burning need to name certain phenomena and to diagnose the epistemological and research situation of the time. Perhaps it fostered the courage to draw up the urgent, strategic tasks that were seen to be laying ahead of Polish anthropology. It has also become a peculiar postmodernism, a kind of dictionary of terms, which have permeated anthropological texts as handy phrases, almost formulaic passages that testified to the grounding of the subject matter in postmodern cognitive disillusion.

It is not an accident that I reach to this expression, aiming to highlight the revindicative character of the reflections that were taken up by the discipline as postmodernist. This gesture of unveiling, showing the lining of the research conducted, the need for differentiating proposed theories is an important moment for the emerging self-consciousness of the discipline.

In most likely the first publication which attempts to describe the discipline trying to tackle postmodernist thought, *O czym opowiada antropologiczna opowieść*¹¹ (W. Burszta, Piątkowski 1994), there is a conviction, according to which:

the discussion within anthropology is in perfect harmony with those trends in the modern humanities, which are termed as postmodernist. In fact, it seems that it is precisely on the example of anthropology that one can show in its full length, what postmodernism is really about, and the ways in which it negates modernism in philosophy, science and art (W. Burszta, Piątkowski 1994: 8).

The image of anthropology as an avant-garde of new thought currents stemming from the criticism of principal modern philosophical assumptions has also appeared in Marian Kempny's book, *Antropologia bez dogmatów – teoria społeczna bez iluzji*¹², according to which “‘postmodernist anthropology’ in its experimental phase in practice implies the suspension of the great nineteenth-century vision of the Science of Man” (Kempny 1994: 145). In another place in the book, we read that “the opposition modernism *versus* postmodernism, which appears in anthropological literature as a simple negation of the first by the latter, (...) breaks down against postmodernization, a particular barrier which modern anthropology is unable to cross. It can be suggested that such barrier is the solution of the problem of interpretation and translation” (Kempny 1994: 186).

The reception of postmodernist thought has thus so far influenced the ways of thinking and speaking about anthropology, about the nature of cognition, the nature of reality and cultural and social practices. However, it primarily inspired the meta-theoretical reflection, which embodied the criticism of the concept of truth, the objectivity of anthropological knowledge and assumptions about the transparency of ethnological data, which form the basis of scientific interpretation. The above-mentioned situation in the discipline has not always been valued positively, as is evidenced by Barbara Olszewska-Dyoniziak's article, *Co to jest postmodernism w antropologii?*¹³. In it, she embeds her reflections in Ernest Gellner's (1997) findings, and

¹¹ Eng. What is said in the anthropological tale.

¹² Eng. Anthropology without dogma – social theory without illusion.

¹³ Eng. What is postmodernism in anthropology?

writes directly that the contemporary currents in anthropology that were influenced by postmodernism, negate “all objectivity of cognition” and disregard “all theoretical and methodological rigor in research”, leading to “cognitive nihilism”, a negation of the possibility of “any scientific knowledge of culture” and the resignation from “a serious attempt to describe something in an accurately documented way that is subject to verification” (Olszewska-Dyoniziak 2000: 6-7). In this statement, we can see the negatively valorized repercussions of the postmodern opening of anthropology, which meant, in short, its departure from epistemological goals.

The clear ambiguity in the assessment of postmodern inspirations in the discipline is apparent in the monograph, *Amerykańska antropologia postmodernistyczna*¹⁴ published in 1999, which is a compilation of translations of texts written by Western anthropologists, who illuminate this current from many points of view. In the introduction to the book, the editors avoided giving a clear answer to the question of whether postmodernism in anthropology existed, leaving the task of solving the issue to the reader. They wrote: “the works contained in this book are meant to reflect the meanders of anthropological reflection called postmodern by many, although we do not settle, whether rightly so” (Buchowski, Kempny 1999: 10). In the further part of the introduction, we read that:

the case of postmodern anthropology fully reflects what is so heavily emphasized in it: that anthropological thinking is conditioned by both, methodological factors and philosophical dilemmas that are treated as common, although not universal, or even more so, transcendental, as well as by historical and cultural contexts (Buchowski, Kempny 1999: 14).

Therefore, as the authors seem to argue, postmodernism has made it clear to anthropologists that cognition is largely situational and, as such, is not based on an *a priori*, positivist concept of science.

Wojciech Burszta devoted a lot of attention to postmodernist inspirations in the discipline, among others, in the collection of reflections: *Czytanie kultury. Pięć szkiców*¹⁵ (1996), and especially in the publication *Różnorodność i tożsamość. Antropologia jako kulturowa*

¹⁴ Eng. American postmodern anthropology.

¹⁵ Eng. Reading culture. Five sketches.

*refleksyjność*¹⁶ (2004), in which the anthropologist carefully looked at the propositions of postmodernist thinking in science, advocating its cautious application in anthropological reflections on cognition, otherness, and in discussions about the usefulness of the notion of culture. He perceived postmodernism as an answer to the end of the reign of “monoculture” and of a “modernist idea for life” (W. Burszta 2004: 49). Brocki, in an article entitled *Antropologia postmodernistyczna wobec krytyki*¹⁷, emphasized that “postmodernists (...) make anthropology the subject of their own interest in order to be able to trace the conditions and ways of constructing the reality examined by an ethnographer” (Brocki 1999: 30), which is consistent with the recognition of other anthropologists (W. Burszta 1992: 130; Kaniowska 1999b: 21; Kempny 1994: 179). In a similar context, Krzysztof Piątkowski saw a kind of helplessness of postmodern anthropology with regard to its subject matter, noting that “the postmodernist reflection upon culture itself as if builds a plexiglass wall in front of itself, demonstrating cognitive helplessness in relation to the endlessness of potentially probable emerging weaves of meanings” (Piątkowski 1999: 37). This statement very clearly underlines the imagined state of the discipline, condemned to self-reflexivity and cognitive nihilism, induced by the realization that, as Burszta wrote in the early 1990s, the task of anthropological practice in the postmodern period is not explanation, but reflection upon the impossibility of explanation” (Burszta 1992: 4).

The fragments extracted from the Polish anthropological publications reflect the atmosphere around postmodernism prevailing in Polish anthropology in the early 1990s. They show clearly that it was presented in terms of novelty, freshness, as well as a clear theoretical relaxation, as if postmodernism allowed for a loosening of corsetal methods of investigation, and at the same time, could not offer a scientific alternative. Its low utility in solving epistemological problems diagnosed in the discipline was feared much earlier.

Unspecified and intuitively applied to Polish scientific realities, postmodernism initially functioned in anthropological discourse, as an exotic “other” – partially recognized, raising concerns, yet intriguing. Its emergence on the cognitive horizon exoticizes not only the horizon itself – the research subject, but also its cognitive strategies. As Janusz Barański emphasized in

¹⁶ Eng. Diversity and identity. Anthropology as cultural reflexivity.

¹⁷ Eng. Postmodern anthropology in consideration of criticism.

the article *Koniec etnologii czy koniec wieku ethnologii? Garść wróżb u progu nowego wieku*¹⁸, judging the consequences of the opening of the native discipline to postmodernism: “we have treated ourselves to a californication of our unrefined, albeit our own and original, ethnology: we are walking on Polish soil, but our heads are as if submerged in Los Angeles’s virtual smog” (Barański 1999: 99). It seems that the problems diagnosed by Western anthropologists were largely related to socio-cultural anthropology in the global dimension. Therefore, efforts to rethink the local form of the discipline in broader, external contexts, seem to be justified. However, the implementation of these considerations in the native discipline does not have to mean a mechanical, thoughtless repetition of interpretative frameworks and anthropological schemes of analysis, developed in different theoretical spaces, the negative effects of which were noticed by Barański:

when reading some of the works of Polish ethnologists inspired by the conclusions of postmodernist anthropology regarding various *native people*, one has the irresistible impression that we are dealing here with a phenomenon related to cloning (...). Such writing (reading, etc.) of culture, comes across, not even as the creation of a virtual reality, but simple fiction, where by using the singular power of the logic of substitution, a Samoan is replaced with a native of Greater Poland. In this way, a native postmodern anthropology is created (Barański 1999: 99).

Since anthropology turned out to be the product of a specific cultural and geopolitical context, the question arose in Polish anthropology about the extent of warranted extrapolation of theories developed in the West to non-Western, e.g., Central European, contexts. Buchowski, already mentioned above, noted that “many Polish ethnologists eagerly refer to ideas developed by their Western colleagues”, emphasizing that “there is of course nothing reprehensible about it, provided that these ideas are used as an inspiration for one’s own interpretation of materials” (Buchowski 2008: 123). However, “often, anthropology was or still is understood to be a practice of re-quotation, recycling of ideas, themes imposed by continental tyrants – deconstruction, postmodernism, literature and anthropology, globalization, mediatization and consumerism” (Buchowski 2008: 123).

¹⁸ Eng. The end of ethnology or the end of the age of ethnology? Several predictions at the threshold of the new century.

The adaptation and diffusion of each discourse is governed by specific economics. It is not worth paying attention to concepts that do not give us a chance of a return on the investment. Therefore, in “Polish-style postmodernism”, investments were made more economically, with greater hope put in making the anthropological statement more attractive, rather than in its implementation in specific research projects. The process was largely based on reaching for stylistics associated with postmodernist discourse, which not only refreshed the language of anthropology, but also focused on evocation – inducing certain approaches and emotions in potential readers (see Czaja 2004, 2013).

The density of the use of metaphors and concepts in anthropological discourse which conventionally could be termed as postmodern has led to a situation in which statements-satellites have appeared, which have taken up an interpretive game with them. Robotycki (1995b: 84) has made a critical statement about this phenomenon, noting that the anthropological reception of philosophical thought is reduced to banalization. A few years later, Kaniowska, when addressing this topic in the article *Antropologia wobec postmodernizmu*¹⁹, pointed out that “violating the requirements of scientific discourse damages the reputation of science, because it threatens to banalize it” (Kaniowska 1999a: 19). As the anthropologist emphasized: “This threat can take a twofold form in science (especially in the disciplines of the hard sciences): we may have to deal with the banalization of the examined reality, but also the second, in my view, the more dangerous, banalization of the cognitive tool” (Kaniowska 1999a: 19). The researcher gave as an example the publications permeated by the essayist concept of science, which can be found on the pages of “Konteksty” (Kaniowska 1999a: 24)²⁰. This cognitive situation favored a kind of self-reproduction of the scientific communication system: argumentative and critical texts of metadiscursive character appeared, and the anthropological community had the impression that a turn had occurred, and the conviction that if not a new current, then at least a new way of interpretation of researched phenomena has emerged. They undoubtedly boosted and refreshed, not only anthropological discourses, but also the image of the discipline in the scientific space (cf. Pomieciński, Sikora, eds. 2009).

¹⁹ Eng. Anthropology in consideration of postmodernism.

²⁰ The cited critical observations on the emergence of postmodernist inspirations in Polish anthropological publications touch upon a particular communicative situation in the discipline that could be defined as, after Jerzy Pelc, an incursion of the humanist literary science into the humanities, which manifests itself in that “the metaphor and abstraction, used together, open the way to building constructs without a basis in empirical reality” attesting to “the depth of the humanist-literate and their ability to construct sophisticated cognitive models” (Pelc 2000: 180).

One can also assume that one of the consequences of adopting postmodern ideas by the Polish anthropological community was the realization that neither modernity nor postmodernity are phenomena of Western origin, and the West is not the only locus of phenomena which can be subject to postmodernist interpretation. In Polish ethnology, it caused researchers to turn to popular culture and widely understood media. Cultural narratives included in movies, painted art, music, and in popular literature provided anthropologists with different modes of articulating the anthropological experience (see W. Burszta 1996, 2004, 2015; W. Burszta, Kuligowski 2005, 2009, Kuligowski 2007, Czubaj 2010, Piątowski 2011). In the period described, some authors published articles in which they re-approached the analysis of everyday, common socio-cultural practices, presented in the context of previously recognized trends and theories, which seemed to give way to new ideas in the discipline, but still proved their cognitive attractiveness (Robotycki 1992; Sulima 2000).

How is the new created to allow the old to survive?

It is not always warranted to project contemporary ideas and research concepts onto the past. However, re-examining texts from the past in accordance with new interpretations is a positive and a not-so-new phenomenon. In the article cited above, Barański noted the negative impact of anthropology practiced within the “Rice gang” on the “methodological critical self-reflection” developed in Poland in the 1990s. In writing about the “American postmodern wave” that hit “our Slavic shores” effectively suppressing “the native reflection, which was held in a similar spirit” (Barański 1999: 2). It is worthwhile to stop here for a moment at this diagnosis, and consider Polish research projects and publications created until the 1990s, which went beyond modernist thinking, not so much anticipating the postmodern in the discipline, but certifying that the modernist model of practicing the discipline had to be negated with time, even if we did not know at the time that it could be called a postmodern opening and we did not realize that we were still somehow stuck in modernism (Latour 2011).

If we consider the element of the reinterpretation of phenomena and the refutation of the theories developed so far as one of the more explicit manifestations of postmodernism in the discipline, it would be hard not to agree with Barański, who, suggests the publication *Chłop*

*potęgą jest i basta*²¹ (Robotycki, Węglarz 1983), which deals with myth of peasantry, as an example of Polish reflection held in this spirit, although not necessarily this rhetoric. Following this path, we could say that if self-reflection is the measure of postmodernism, then certain publications can be referred to as “postmodernish” in the process of contemporary re-interpretation, for instance, Maria Czaplicka's *Mój rok na Syberii* (2013)²², Kazimiera Zawistowicz-Adamska's *Spółeczność wiejska*²³ (1948), and many more, especially recently thought books (cf. Kaniowska 1999b: 149-177), written decades ago when anthropologists' heads were immersed in the clouds of Polish cities and villages, or in Siberian snowstorms, and no one dreamed of the virtual smog of Los Angeles. A good example of a text that brings out the “postmodern potential” of an older publication is the re-reading of Józef Burszta's book *The Village and the Inn* (1950) by Kacper Pobłocki, who sees it as “an attempt to show how vodka was an integral part of the everyday life and folklore of peasants and how nobility have forced peasants to consume vodka since the 16th century” (Pobłocki 2009: 242). The researcher emphasizes that this is an idea “as innovative and inspirational as the book *Sweetness and Power* written three decades later by Sidney Mintz” (Pobłocki 2009: 242). He also argues that the way in which Burszta describes the famous “lack of morality” of Polish peasants, partially brings to mind Thompson's concept of “moral economy”, and that his findings could have made a global career (Pobłocki 2009: 242).

In this regard, it is worth mentioning, among others, Thomas Rakowski's research project, reconstructed in the publication *Etnografia/Animacja/Sztuka*²⁴ (Rakowski 2013). The ideological dimension of this ethnographic and animation project is important, as it is aimed at confronting “a fairly common social imagination, within which the social and cultural life of Polish rural areas is recognized as incomplete, lagging behind, requiring education and a remedial program” (Rakowski 2013: 8). However, these communities are actually ripe in “local competence”, “grassroots creativity” and “cultural hot spots”, which could be brought out, unveiled and stimulated by ethnographic and animation activities based on collaboration with the local communities, creating “culture in action” (Rakowski 2013). : 24). One could say that practicing ethnography in collaboration with art and cultural animation, presented here out of

²¹ Eng. The peasant is powerful, period!

²² The book *My Siberian Year* by M. Czaplicka was published for the first time in London in 1916.

²³ Eng. The rural community.

²⁴ Eng. Ethnography/Animation/Art.

necessity only briefly, was made possible by a “postmodern consent”. However, the issue becomes more complicated when we read into the sources that inspired this undertaking. They go deeper, drawing on the phenomenology of Maurice Merleau-Ponty. What also comes to mind are some analogies to the style of practicing ethnography by Jacek Olędzki, which we can reconstruct while reading the book *Murzynowo* – a monograph containing descriptions aimed at the disillusion of an image of rural culture, ingrained in traditional publications.

In a sense, in this publication, the ethnologist makes a critical analysis of the previous ways of describing traditional culture, and at the same time, unveils the political and social determinants of these descriptions. Is it legitimate, thus, to declare that he anticipates the revindicative reading of anthropological texts, who got their impetus from the poststructural foundations of postmodernism? Joanna Tokarska-Bakir (1995) followed such path of reading Jacek Olędzki’s ethnography, but in the end did not consider his work as unambiguously postmodern, as Mokrzan did (2014: 19), in order to show the mechanism of postmodern anticipation in Polish anthropology. Tokarska-Bakir has clearly states that she does not intend to reduce Jacek Olędzki’s work “to the label ‘postmodernist researcher’, nor to show the paradox of someone who, by using the tried-and-true method of ‘escaping backwards’, anticipated his modern epoch” (Tokarska-Bakir 1995: 19).

Similar doubts may be raised by the postmodernist label applied to the book *Bałuckie chronotopy. Opowieść o łódzkiej dzielnicy*²⁵ (Krupa-Ławrynowicz 2013), which tells the story of the titular district. It is embedded in the current of urban anthropology, reaching to sociological and philosophical concepts, and taking Mikhail Bakhtin's ideas as its main inspiration, above all his concept of the chronotope. It has a rich narrative and the presence of the anthropologist-author, who intertwines her own experience of the titular district with the analysis. Following the path of the trans-disciplinarity of this publication, one could say that it is an example of a postmodern opening in the discipline that brings to life Bakhtin's concepts historically embedded in modernism, in harmony with the ideology, and going beyond modernity in its thinking (cf. Vrhel 1993: 7-22). However, it is worth bearing in mind that the directions of borrowings can be reversed, showing that the repetition of certain thematic lines, concepts and metaphors is observed thanks to the “memory of the discipline”. It is made possible, inter alia,

²⁵ Eng. Bałuckie chronotopes. The story of a Łódź neighborhood.

both thanks to the relatively slow aging of anthropology, and the fact that, within the discipline, we can observe not so much radical epistemological cuts, as a constant widening of its epistemology. Therefore, often the “new” turns out to be a chance for the survival of the “old” in anthropology, as paradoxically, it can extract and refresh from the past outworn, discredited, and forgotten ideas. The history of the development of anthropology has proven this many times.

Emancipatory dimensions of the Polish postmodernist undertaking

Sometimes, it is hard to resist the impression that so far, commentators of the postmodern opening of the discipline attribute its meaning a much wider scope than just the space of science. It may be said that the aforementioned opening carried with it a certain potential to liberate the discipline of both “ethnographism” and theory, which, on the wave of transformation, turned out to be too narrow for its ever-increasing cognitive horizons. Postmodernism also assumed some sort of transposition, demythologization, unveiling the lining of existing theories, in order to indicate their dependence, ideological entanglements, and worldview sympathies. Thus, the inspirations coming from postmodernism did not influence the stability and reproduction of previous anthropological practices, but, on the contrary, they brought with them the need to rethink social, cultural and geopolitical contexts. Certain manifestations of this “new consciousness” of the researcher could be found in, for example, the texts that make up the volume *Teren w antropologii. Praktyka badacza we współczesnej antropologii kulturowej*²⁶ (Buliński, Kairski, eds., 2011). On the other hand, voices casting doubt on the dialogicity and the associated emancipation of minorities and subordinate groups, which the “logic” of cognition had so far located in the outskirts, appeared very fast, and if it included them in the scope of its interests, then they were usually introduced bearing the status of a reified other.

In the Polish anthropological community, attention was being paid to the fact that postmodernism, by sharpening the ideologism of anthropological knowledge, was itself strengthening its foundations by introducing axiology, according to which scientific knowledge is good when it supports minority groups that had been negatively affected, and it is bad when it is used for their repression. According to Brocki, this moral model of knowledge “however, loses a fundamental characteristic of science, which is the crossing of cultural constraints (...), it eliminates criticism in favor of fear of punishment for dissident interpretations – instead of

²⁶ Eng. The field in anthropology. Research practice in contemporary anthropological and cultural studies.

liberating (as normal science does), the moral model is inherently oppressive” (Brocki 2008: 41)²⁷. Marcin Lubaś (2003: 4) reached for other arguments, aimed at unmasking the weaknesses of postmodernism in anthropology. He embedded them in the principles of scientific knowledge based on empiricism, theory and method, and thus, on the triad, which according to the researcher is not of interest to representatives of postmodernist anthropology, who only consider history and social and cultural contexts of knowledge as the subjects of their reflection.

One could thus ask, what purpose did these recognitions, critical of postmodernism in anthropology, serve, apart from the fact that they explicitly essentialized its image by placing it on the side of action and reflection that threatened the science embedded in the rigor of empiricism, verifiability and communicability of anthropological knowledge? Mokrzan, noticing this phenomenon, explains it only on the level of rhetoric, as “the construction of the great quantifier that had a political goal”, seeing it in “activities aimed at maintaining either the identity of the discipline, or the theoretical and methodological identities of individual groups of anthropologists”, and adding that “such action was founded on an erroneous, but strategic recognition of what modernism and postmodernism were” (Mokrzan 2014: 21). However, what raises questions is not so much the consequent and just defense of anthropology’s epistemological goals, but rather, a certain exaggeration of dangers, which were seen in the spread of postmodernism in the discipline. Especially that it is clear from a perspective of time that the scale of its influence on Polish anthropology was not small, perhaps, but it did not have the potential that could change it in a radical way. The reason is that the influence of postmodernism on anthropology consisted in the popularization of concepts and theories associated with it, followed by their discussion, which enhanced the meta-anthropological reflection and contributed to the widening of the anthropological inter-discourse. It would be hard to disagree that the postmodernist inspiration played a role in the remodeling of empirical research, however, it should be underscored that it happened not so much with the postmodern opening of the discipline, but thanks to the reactions to it: reflexive, literary and interpretive, which I tried to show in a different publication (Majbroda 2015b).

²⁷ This statement is one of many in the debate that has for some time been transferred to the fields of engaged and applied anthropology (see, for example, Baer 2014; Brocki 2013). Its discussion, however, goes beyond the scope of this text.

Conclusion

Postmodernist inspirations in anthropology are no longer controversial today, they solidified and settled in Polish anthropological discourse to the point where they seem to be quite transparent. Postmodernism “Polish-style postmodernism” functioned in a specific translational domain, where the literal understanding of “translation” does not exhaust the contexts of the mentioned functioning. On the one hand, anthropologists adjusted their anti-fundamentalist assumptions to the realities of their own discipline, which translated into posing new questions, made it possible to see previously unnoticed phenomena and to make attempts at the illumination of the old in new contexts. On the other hand, a continuous process of criticism of the condition of the discipline started, which got swept away by the postmodern opening. Attempts to apply postmodernism in Polish anthropology were, however, inspired by the impulses stemming from local cultural heritage and the characteristic challenges of Polish everyday life. Often, the clash of these universal, after all, modes of interpretation with the idiosyncratic nature of the local phenomena created new research undertakings, which this text references. They testify to the postmodern opening of Polish socio-cultural anthropology. This openness, which I perceive as a realized reality, though not pervasive, is a phenomenon that already belongs to the history of the discipline, and which has been surpassed by performative ethnology, anthropology turned to affect and experience of reality, post-posthumanities and many others that are waiting to be named, and that are finding it difficult to make their way to the anthropological debate.

Yet again, posing the question articulated outside of anthropology by Reinhold Martin, repeated a while ago by Kaniowska, and more recently by Mokrzan: “Have we ever been postmodern?”. One could answer: yes, repeatedly, and adding that the present, multifaceted face of anthropology has been shaped to a certain degree by postmodernist inspirations. It would be naïve to say that under their influence, a distinct trend in the discipline known as “Polish-style” postmodern anthropology has been shaped. It is easy to see, however, that postmodernism was more than a “pot in which so much is boiling, that the status of the ingredients that constitute the subject of our interest is problematic” (Mokrzan 2014: 19). Thus, I would not look for the weaknesses of the postmodern opening of anthropology in the amplification of the concept of terrain and the multiplication of the object of its investigation. This process was, by the way, one of the elements of the anthropologization of the discipline, and today it is one of its essential

features. A question worth asking could relate to how we deal with this variety. Are we able to avoid the trivialization of the anthropological discourse? Do we have contextual theories that would enable us to combine these “ingredients” in new ways, without sacrificing the epistemological ambitions of the discipline? Is it possible to escape from this eclecticism? These questions remain open. One of the possible answers is suggested by the attractiveness of anthropology practiced contemporarily, which grows out of, among others, the above-mentioned, perhaps only seeming, contradictions.

REFERENCES

- Baer M. 2014 *Między nauką a aktywizmem. O polityczności, płci i antropologii*, Wrocław: Katedra Etnologii i Antropologii Kulturowej.
- Barański J. 1999 *Koniec etnologii czy koniec wieku etnologii? Garść wroźb u progu nowego wieku*, „Konteksty. Polska Sztuka Ludowa” 53: 4, pp. 96-105.
- Brach-Czaina J. 1995 *Progi polskiego feminizmu*, „Kwartalnik Pedagogiczny” 1-2 (158-159), pp. 341-348.
- Brocki M. 1999 *Antropologia postmodernistyczna wobec krytyki*, in: A. Paluch (ed.), *Transformacja, ponowoczesność wokół nas i w nas*, Wrocław: Katedra Etnologii i Antropologii Kulturowej, pp. 27-34.
- 2008 *Antropologia – literatura – dialog – przekład*, Wrocław: Katedra Etnologii i Antropologii Kulturowej.
- 2013 *Antropologia społeczna i kulturowa w przestrzeni publicznej*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- 2014 *Writing Culture, czyli rewolucja-widmo*, „Zeszyty Etnologii Wrocławskiej” 2 (21), pp. 29-37.
- Buchowski M. 1990 *Racjonalność, translacja, interpretacja*, Poznań: Uniwersytet im. A. Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.
- 1995 *Nieznosna lekkość metafor i ich dyskretny urok*, w: J. Sójka (ed.), *Horyzonty ponowoczesności. Rozmowy z Zygmuntem Baumanem*, cz. 2, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Fundacji Humaniora, pp. 187-200.
- 1996 *Klasa i kultura w okresie transformacji: antropologiczne studium przypadku społeczności lokalnej w Wielkopolsce*, Berlin: Centre Marc Bloch.
- 2001 *Rethinking Transformation: An Anthropological Perspective On Postsocialism*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Fundacji Humaniora.
- 2004 *Zrozumieć Innego. Antropologia racjonalności*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- 2008 *Trudny dialog: relacje wiedzy między zachodnią antropologią a środkowo-europejską etnologią*, in: H. Czachowski, A. Mianecki (eds), *Do Torunia kupić kunia*, Toruń: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze, Oddział w Toruniu, pp. 161-187.

- 2012 *Etnologia polska: historie i powinowactwa*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Nauka i Innowacje.
- Buchowski M., Burszta W.J.
1992 *O założeniach interpretacji antropologicznej*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Buchowski M., Kempny M.
1999 *Czy istnieje antropologia postmodernistyczna?*, in: M. Buchowski (ed.), *Amerykańska antropologia postmodernistyczna*, Warszawa: Instytut Kultury, pp. 9-28.
- Buliński T., Kairski M. (red.)
2011 *Teren w antropologii. Praktyka badawcza we współczesnej Antropologii kulturowej*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Burszta J.
1950 *Wieś i karczma. Rola karczmy w życiu wsi pańszczyźnianej*, Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza.
- Burszta W.J.
1992 *Wymiary antropologicznego poznania kultury*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- 1996 *Czytanie kultury. Pięć szkiców*, Poznań, Łódź: Instytut Etnologii i Antropologii Kulturowej, Wydawnictwo Łódzkie.
- 2004 *Rożnorodność i tożsamość. Antropologia jako kulturowa refl eksyjność*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.
- 2015 *Preteksty*, Gdańsk: Katedra.
- Burszta W.J., Kuligowski W.
2005 *Sequel. Dalsze przygody kultury w globalnym świecie*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Muza.
- 2009 *Dlaczego kościotrup nie wstaje. Ponowoczesne pejzaże kultury*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sic!.
- Burszta W.J., Piątkowski K.
1994 *O czym opowiada antropologiczna opowieść*, Warszawa: Instytut Kultury.
- Clifford J.
1988 *The Predicament of Culture. Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature and Art*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Clifford J., Marcus G. (eds.)
1986 *Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Czaja D.
2004 *Sygnatura i fragment. Narracje antropologiczne*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- 2013 *Znaki szczególne. Antropologia jako ćwiczenie duchowe*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Czaplicka M.
2013 *Mój rok na Syberii*, trans. H. Kossak-Nowocień, Toruń: Muzeum Etnograficzne im. Marii Znamierowskiej-Prüfferowej w Toruniu.
- Czubaj M.
2010 *Etnolog w Mieście Grzechu. Powieść kryminalna jako świadectwo antropologiczne*, Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Oficynka.
- Gellner E.
1997 *Postmodernizm, rozum i religia*, przeł. A. Kowalczyk, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Jasiewicz Z.

- 2006 *Etnologia polska. Między etnografią a antropologią kulturową*, „Nauka” 2, pp. 65-80.
- Kaniowska K.
1995 *Czy trudno dziś być antropologiem?*, „Lud” 78, pp. 279-291.
- 1999a *Antropologia wobec postmodernizmu*, in: A. Paluch (red.), *Transformacja, ponowoczesność wokół nas i w nas*, Wrocław: Katedra Etnologii i Antropologii Kulturowej, pp. 11-26.
- 1999b *Opis. Klucz do rozumienia kultury*, Łódź: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze.
- Kempny M.
1994 *Antropologia bez dogmatów – teoria społeczna bez iluzji*, Warszawa: Polska Akademia Nauk.
- Krupa-Ławrynowicz A.
2013 *Bałuckie chronotopy. Opowieść o łódzkiej dzielnicy*, Wrocław, Łódź: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze.
- Kuligowski W.
2001 *Antropologia refleksyjna. O rzeczywistości tekstu*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Poznańskiego.
- 2003 *Kanon antropologii: heroiczny i heretycki*, in: J. Eichsteadt, K. Piątkowski (eds), *Nie-złota legenda. Kanoniczność i apokryficzność w kulturze*, Ożarów: Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Muzeum Wnętrz Dworskich w Ożarowie, pp. 217-230.
- 2007 *Antropologia współczesności. Wiele światów, jedno miejsce*, Kraków: Universitas.
- 2015 *Kryzys i karnawał*, in: J. Barański, M. Golonka-Czajkowska, A. Niedźwiedź (eds), *W krainie metarefleksji. Księga poświęcona profesorowi Czesławowi Robotyckiemu*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, pp. 38-50.
- Latour B.
2011 *Nigdy nie byliśmy nowocześni: studium z antropologii symetrycznej*, trans. M. Gdula, Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa.
- Lubaś M.
2003 *Rozum i etnografia. Przyczynek do krytyki antropologii postmodernistycznej*, Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy Nomos.
- 2014 *Writing Culture i spór o kształt krytyki wiedzy*, „Zeszyty Etnologii Wrocławskiej” 2 (21), pp. 39-65.
- Lyotard J.-F.
1997a *Odpowiedź na pytanie: co to jest postmodernizm?*, trans. M.P. Markowski, in: R. Nycz (ed.), *Postmodernizm. Antologia przekładów*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Baran i Suszczyński, pp. 47-61.
- 1997b *Kondycja ponowoczesna. Raport o stanie wiedzy*, przeł. M. Kowalska, J. Migasiński, Warszawa: Fundacja Aletheia.
- Majbroda K.
2011 *Antropologia interpretatywna Clifforda Geertza – ucieczka dyscypliny w tekstowy świat?*, in: A. Szafrński (ed.), *Clifford Geertz a hybrydowa wersja antropologii interpretacyjnej*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, pp. 49-80.
- 2014a *Between Science and Literature: The Literary Turn in Socio-Cultural Anthropology*, in: A. Posern-Zieliński, L. Mróz (eds), *Middle Grounds, Ambiguous Frontiers and Intercultural Spaces*, Poznań: Instytut im. Oskara Kolberga, pp. 193-214.
- 2014b *O kontekstach i stylach recepcji książki Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography w polskiej antropologii społeczno-kulturowej*, „Zeszyty Etnologii Wrocławskiej” 2 (21), pp. 11-28.
- 2015a *Clifford Geertz's Interpretive Anthropology. Between Text, Experience and*

- 2015b *Theory*, trans. I. Kołbon, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
Wpływ zwrotu interpretatywnego na metody badań jakościowych, czyli remodelowanie antropologicznych praktyk badawczych pod wpływem kategorii literaturoznawczych, „Zeszyty Etnologii Wrocławskiej” 1 (22), pp. 45-68.
- Marcus G.
1980 *Rhetoric and the Ethnographic Genre in the Anthropological Research*, “Current Anthropology” 21: 4, pp. 507-510.
- Mokrzan M.
2014 *Odpowiedź na pytanie, czy kiedykolwiek byliśmy postmodernistami?*, „Etnografia Polska” 58: 1-2, pp. 5-23.
- Olędzki J.
1991 *Murzynowo. Znaki istnienia i tożsamości kulturalnej mieszkańców wioski nadwiślańskiej XVIII-XX w.*, Warszawa: Instytut Etnologii i Antropologii Kulturowej Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Olszewska-Dyoniziak B.
2000 *Co to jest postmodernizm w antropologii?*, „Etnografia Polska” 44: 1-2, pp. 5-14.
- Pelc J.
2000 *Myśli o języku humanistyki*, in: J. Pelc (ed.), *Język współczesnej humanistyki*, Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Semiotyczne, pp. 171-204.
- Piątkowski K.
1999 *Opowiadać czy obrazować – ironiczne pytanie o dylemat antropologów schyłku tysiąclecia*, in: A. Paluch (ed.), *Transformacja, ponowoczesność wokół nas i w nas*, Wrocław: Katedra Etnologii i Antropologii Kulturowej, pp. 35-40.
- 2011 *Mit – Historia – Pamięć. Kulturowe konteksty antropologii/etnologii*, Łódź: Księży Młyn Dom Wydawniczy.
- Pobłocki K.
2009 *Whither Anthropology without Nation-state? Interdisciplinarity, World Anthropologies and Commoditization of Knowledge*, „Critique of Anthropology” 29: 2, pp. 225-252.
- Pomieczński A., Sikora S. (eds)
2009 *Zanikające granice. Antropologizacja nauki i dyskursów o niej*, Poznań: Biblioteka Telgte.
- Rakowski T.
2009 *Łowcy, zbieracze, praktycy niemocy: etnografia człowieka zdegradowanego*, Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo słowo / obraz terytoria.
- 2013 *Etnografia/Animacja/Sztuka. Wprowadzenie*, w: T. Rakowski (ed.), *Etnografia/Animacja/Sztuka. Nierozpoznane wymiary rozwoju kulturalnego*, Warszawa: Narodowe Centrum Kultury, pp. 6-41.
- Robotycki C.
1992 *Etnograf a wobec kultury współczesności*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- 1995a *Antropologia kultury w Polsce – projekt urzeczywistniony*, „Lud” 78, pp. 227-243.
- 1995b *O banalizacji tekstów w etnologii*, in: A. Posern-Zieliński (ed.), *Etnologia polska między ludoznawstwem a antropologią*, Poznań: Komitet Nauk Etnologicznych PAN, pp. 83-89.
- Robotycki C., Węglarz S.
1983 *Chłop potęgą jest i basta. O mityzacji kultury ludowej w nauce*, „Polska Sztuka Ludowa” 37: 1-2, pp. 3-8.
- Scholte B.
1987 *The Literary Turn in Contemporary Anthropology*, „Critique of Anthropology”

- 7: 1, pp. 33-47.
- Sokolewicz Z.
2010 *Rewolucja, konflikt pokoleń czy kumulacja doświadczeń – zmiana pytań badawczych w etnografii polskiej po II wojnie światowej*, in: A. Malewska-Szałygin, M. Radkowska-Walkowicz (red.), *Antropolog wobec współczesności. Tom w darze Profesor Annie Zadrożyńskiej*, Warszawa: Instytut Etnologii i Antropologii Kulturowej, pp. 15-35.
- 2011 „*Moje życie naukowe można sprowadzić do próbowania kolejnego klucza z wielkiego pęku, który dała mi teoria poznania*”. *Odpowiedzi na pytania Zbigniewa Jasiewicza*, „Lud” 95, pp. 303-354.
- Sperber D.
1985 *Anthropology and Psychology: Toward an Epistemology of Representations*, „Man” 20: 1, pp. 73-89.
- Sulima R.
2000 *Antropologia codzienności*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Tokarska-Bakir J.
1990 *Interpretacja, czyli o sztuce w antropologii*, „Konteksty. Polska Sztuka Ludowa” 44: 1, pp. 3-7.
- 1995 *Dalsze losy syna marnotrawnego. Projekt etnografii nieprzezroczystej*, „Konteksty. Polska Sztuka Ludowa” 49: 1, pp. 13-22.
- Vattimo G.
1997 *Postnowoczesność i kres historii*, przeł. B. Stelmaszczyk, w: R. Nycz (red.), *Postmodernizm. Antologia przekładów*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Baran i Suszczyński, pp. 128-144.
- Vrhel F.
1993 *Bachtinowskie inspiracje w postmodernistycznej etnografii*, przeł. J. Zarek, „Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Etnograficzne” 32, pp. 7-2.
- Zawistowicz-Adamska K.
1948 *Społeczność wiejska. Doświadczenia i rozważania z badań terenowych w Zaborowie*, Łódź: Polski Instytut Służby Społecznej.

MAGDALENA KOZHEVNIKOVA
Institute of Philosophy
Russian Academy of Sciences
Moscow
Russia

HUMAN-ANIMAL HYBRIDS AND CHIMERAS IN SCIENCE HISTORY AND TODAY¹

Preliminary Remarks

Hybridization of man, whether in the direction of technology (cyborg), or nature (human-animal), may be considered within the current of human enhancement. This “enhancement” requires quotation marks, however, because it is unclear whether or not there is actual enhancement and something is made better. Better for whom? For the individual or society? Improved physically? Or also improved mentally, morally and intellectually? These and many other questions and concerns about the broadly understood “enhancement” of man require a transdisciplinary approach. Across the world, research in this field is gaining momentum; conducted by representatives of the hard sciences and humanities, frequently cooperating with each other. We are dealing with a blurring of boundaries: not only does the object of research (the post-human, trans-human, hybrid) not subject itself to unequivocal classification, but also the development of scientific research intertwines – like a double helix of DNA – what used to be separate.

“Thought experiments” concerning hybrids and chimeras have always been present in different cultures. These fantastic creations are variations on the topic of crossing inter-species boundaries. The development of science gradually made a more and more complete realization of these ideas possible. Milestones in the history of hybridization and chimerization are presented below. Today, we can create real hybrids at the level of combined DNA of different species. Such “human-animals” are created in laboratories and their purpose is supposed to be the testing of drugs or therapy development. However, the practical purpose of science has many other hidden meanings, which we can read by reaching to cultural texts and topoi that we carry in ourselves.

¹This publication has been prepared under a grant of the Russian Science Foundation (Project No. 15-18-30057). An extended and revised version of the article *Gibridy i himery čeloveka i životnogo v nauke: Istoriâ i sovremennoe sostoianie issledovânij* (Koževnikova 2015).

In my research I used extensive scientific literature. I used the historical method for describing and analyzing the research that was conducted over the centuries. I also used the linguistic-cultural method of cultural text analysis, in which I include not only literature, art, film, but also popular culture and the internet. I was looking for reactions to human-animals and to the latest achievements of biotechnology in those spaces. I examined the emotions and associations that they raise among those whom, following Pavel Tišenko, I call the “profane”. Tiszczenko, in examining the relationship between the profane and the expert in the sphere of bioethical discussion, points to the pragmatism of the former and notes:

[When listening and evaluating the profane cannot check the scientific basis that the expert is guided by, but he can fully imagine the variants of the subject in situations in case of the recognition or non-recognition of the expert’s evidence. These topics can always be discussed with others, you can play out new situations based on expert statements in your imagination] (Tišenko 2001: 172)².

It is similar in the case of cultural texts, in which experiments and scientific discoveries are “immersed” in all kinds of life situations, testing their “endurance” and pointing to those aspects that were unnoticed by scholars and philosophers.

In bioethics – “[a republic where experts and the profane participate equally]” (Tišenko 2001: 14) – public opinion is very important because the discipline is “not only a ‘section of the academy’, but also a fragment of social life, which stretches between the strictly understood academic world, politics and the space of public debate taking place in the mass media”, as Jan Hartman (2002) notes. This stems directly from the history of bioethics: at its inception in the 1960s, the opportunity to make decisions was transferred from a narrow circle of specialists into the hands of ordinary citizens (e.g. by appointing bioethical committees).

To me, an important source of hidden meanings are cultural texts, starting with the earliest times, when the human-animals “inhabited” the world densely, to the latest works of popular culture. As Magdalena Radkowska-Walkowicz writes, analyzing a different kind of hybrid – “artificial people”:

² All translations from source languages other than English are mine – Z.B.

in times of uncertain identity (sometimes referred to as a flickering existence), creating your own personal narrative through the media, we look for answers to these questions [about human nature – M.K.] – rarely asked directly – less often from philosophers, and more often from writers and filmmakers (Radkowska-Walkowicz 2008: 24).

Popular culture can give us some idea of the contemporary understanding of what is “human” and what are its limits? Looking at others – animals, monsters, cyborgs or hybrids – can be a form of searching for an answer to the question about what or who a human is. Radkowska-Walkowicz examines “artificial people” according to this key, while Anna Wieczorkiewicz does the same with monsters. As the researcher writes:

Thinking with the help of monstrous figures is one of the cultural strategies of dealing with the dilemmas of human existence. There is among these dilemmas a painful association between the live sensation of one’s own being and one’s self, and knowledge of the physical variability of forms. Hybrid and deformed characters in a way evoke these meanings (Wieczorkiewicz 2010: 166).

I, too, in my exploration of hybrids and chimeras, seek in them, among other things, answers the question about the concept of human nature³. In this text I focus, however, on tracing the history of experimentation on the boundary of our species, as well as on crossing this boundary, and I present the most important ethical concerns that can be raised by human-animals brought to life in the laboratory.

The history of experiments

Long before Dolly the sheep and oncomouse were created in a laboratory, Earth was “inhabited” by Centaurs, Sphynxes, Minotaur and other creatures, combining the characteristics of animals and humans. The huge number of representations of chimeras and human-animal hybrids in world cultures, beginning with the earliest times to this day, may indicate that crossing the boundary separating man from other animals has always been a fascinating subject. It can be

³ I have devoted some of my other publications to these issues (Koževnikova 2013, 2016, 2016b).

assumed that the development of the motif of the human-animal in the works of culture (myths, literature, films, etc.) reflects, to a certain extent, the development of science and its reception in society. The history of this motif can be conventionally divided into stages reflecting the degree of human influence on the environment and his knowledge of the mechanisms and laws governing what is happening around him. One can roughly assume that the oldest human-animals are an embodiment of the feeling of a very limited human influence on the environment and a belief in the supernatural order – they are eternal or created by supernatural forces, independent of humans (e.g. various ancient deities in mythologies). Later hybrids are related to human activity and symbolically mark humans' attempts to influence the environment with the use of magic or knowledge stemming from faith in supernatural powers (e.g. Minotaur, whose beginning and end of life is related to the direct impact of man, as well as werewolves, whose existence is closely intertwined with the lives of people). The last stage of development of this motif is characterized by hybrids and chimeras being the result of the actions of a human-scientist. They are accompanied by contradictory feelings of admiration and fear in the face of the emerging opportunities of science (the dog-human Szarikov from Bulgakov's story *Heart of a Dog*, Ichtlander – the boy whose life is saved by a doctor who transplants shark gills in place of his sick lungs, from Bieliajev's novel, etc.). At this point, it should be emphasized that cultural hybrids and chimeras are always the creations of their period, and even if human fantasy places them in the past or in the future, the meanings in them remain the meanings of the present. The word “stages” is used here quite conventionally, because the boundaries between them are fluid, and ideas penetrate each other. The most important issue is however, that examples of numerous hybrids and human-animal chimeras in different cultures of the world show that the idea of a human-animal is nothing new. Modern science makes this idea possible.

It would seem that in scientific experiments in the field of the formation of hybrids (the effect of such crossing-breeding of two organisms that in every cell of the new organism, there is a full set of “parental” genes) and chimeras (organisms have cells, organs, or genes of other organisms, belonging to the same or other species) could only begin with the development of genetics. However, Jean Rostand, a French biologist and an ethicist, as an example of what he calls “[creative biology]”, cites the experiments of the Swiss zoologist Abraham Trembley, which date back to 1743. Trembley performed surgeries on freshwater hydras, combining their various parts and creating new organisms. Although these experiments were far from creating a human-

animal, the idea of these experiments was close to it. In any case, Rostand interprets them, writing: “[By conducting these famous experiments, Trembley not only discovered the wonders of nature: he also showed that he could actively intervene in the field of life phenomena, he played the role of wizard, and already behaved like ‘a creator of phenomena’]” (Rostand 1964: 23). The author enthusiastically writes about similar experiments, calling the scientists of those days “the Picassos of laboratories”. Besides Trembley, many other scholars of that era tried to create animal chimeras, transplanting organs and genitals between species and sexes, or attempted to influence the appearance and manner of reproduction of animals in a different way. Rostand emphasizes that in those times, it took special courage and a relaxed attitude towards nature. Indeed, Rostand himself refers to nature without any special respect, emphasizing that it only produces, while man – creates. He translates these experiments as a “[deep human tendency – as a factor of aesthetic nature is probably at play here. The creative experience is in a way a work of art, because it allows the researcher to objectify the fantasy, giving room for collaboration to his creativity with the forces of nature]” (Rostand 1964: 26).

This context of Trembley’s experiments raises associations with the contemporary works of bioart, i.e., activities on the border of art and biotechnology. The creative experience Rostand wrote about, as well as the need to aestheticize and give meaning to what develops beyond the world of human categories, is manifested both in art (e.g. Michał Brzezinski or Eduard Kac) and in some areas of human activity (animal breeding, e.g. pure-breed dogs – see. Gajewska 2012; Dąbrowska 2012).

Rostand, in the middle of the twentieth century, was afraid whether experiments with chimerization might lead to a man “[juggling his own nature]”. He did not exclude the need for such activities for therapeutic purposes, however, he stressed that “[we should ban the production of monsters among our species]” (Rostand 1964: 27). The monsters probably mean here the same thing as they did for the Renaissance collectors of peculiarities, about whom Wiczorkiewicz writes: “monsters are created by the combination of species” (Wiczorkiewicz 2010: 82). What is a result of crossing boundaries will be monstrous. As far as Rostand’s understanding is concerned (alongside modern gatherers of peculiarities), animal hybrids and chimeras constitute a type of intellectual entertainment, a kind of rebus for the researcher, while a human chimera would be a violation of order and a degeneration of the human race.

Russian scientist Ilja Ivanov was not afraid of creating “monsters among our species”. In the 1920s, he conducted experiments on the crossbreeding of apes with humans. In 1926, Ivanov went to Africa for this purpose; the trip was promoted by the Soviet government and the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, as well as the Pasteur Institute in Paris. Ivanov performed the insemination of female chimpanzees with human semen. He was not the first scholar, to have come up with the idea, but no one had gone beyond its theoretical considerations, primarily due to ethical constraints. It is astonishing that in the 1920s in the USSR, Ivanov’s experiments were not considered as unethical. Ethical issues were apparently not significant compared to the potential benefits of Ivanov’s research. Kirill Rossiânov comments on this as follows:

[Apparently, moral arguments against Ivanov’s experiments were, in the minds of most scholars, associated either with a religious outlook which opposes humans to animals (which from their point of view was wrong) or with the direct use of ignorance and prejudice of the masses, including the so-called “miracle, mystery and authority”. W. Szymkiewicz said this clearly even before the revolution: “In any case, we have no right to refrain from this experiment [inseminating female monkeys with semen. K.R.] because of ideas of the kind that in the Middle Ages brought women suspected of copulation with animals and who gave birth to bastards against nature]” (Rossiânov 2006).

The impassable boundary between man and animal in the Soviet period was considered obsolete, a result of the influence of religion and superstition. In the “new” times, there was no place for this, so this ideological principle became an argument in favor of Ivanov's experiments. However, Rossiânov looks deeper into this and comes to astonishing conclusions:

[Their [Bolshevik-M.K.] support may not have had much in common with ideology, as well as the “new”, “revolutionary” morality. Scientists who were far from such ideology, unrelated professionally to the problem of anthropogenesis and therefore in no way “interested” in Ivanov's experiments, reacted favorably to them. Among them were P. Roux, L. Calmette, W. Szymkiewicz, G. Koževnikov, as well as W. Wiernadski and N. Vaviłov, each of whom could serve as a model of honesty and morality. This proves that it is difficult to present convincing arguments against the experiments of crossbreeding, though it would seem that it is not so. Perhaps they cannot be formulated at all, if we use “contemporary” rather than “medieval” morality. A morality, which puts the individual in the forefront,

considers as immoral only what harms people, but in no way “offends” nor “disgraces” “beings” who put themselves above the individual (even if one of them is the human species itself)] (Rossiânov 2006).

The quoted excerpt makes us refocus on what is in fact unethical about Ivanov’s experiments from a contemporary point of view. Is our intuitive belief in the immorality of the crossbreeding of monkeys with humans really not supported by specific ethical arguments? Such a statement would be confirmed by the words of German researcher Matthias Beck, who writes:

[It is difficult to answer the question of why we should not create such beings. Intuition, which tells us not to do it, is just a hint, but not a sufficient argument. The argumentation is certainly related to the fact that humans have a different status to animals and do not want human sex cells (sperm and ova) to be used to create a new life form] (Beck 2009: 280).

Beck bases her argument on religious assumptions, however, if the religious point of view is refused, the “different status” of humans cannot be defended. The development of genetics, neural sciences and biotechnology consistently eliminates the last remaining theses on the boundaries separating people from the rest of living beings. As the famous primatologist Frans de Waal writes:

[humanity does not cease to seek the differences between us [humans and monkeys – M.K.] and to claim its advantage, but not many of the proposed differences remain in force for more than 10 years. If you look at our biological species objectively, without the fascination with the technical achievements of the last several millennia, you will see a creature of blood and flesh, with a brain that, although three times the size of a chimpanzee’s brain, does not contain any new parts (...) No one doubts the superiority of the human intellect, but we have no basic desires or needs that would not be present in our immediate relatives. Monkeys, as well as people, aspire to power, enjoy sex, want security and sympathy, kill for territory, value trust and cooperation. Yes, we have computers and planes, but psychologically we are still built just as the rest of the social primates] (de Vaal’ 2014: 49-50).

Rossiânov points out that the thought of cross-breeding of man and animal will still raise negative emotions and create the impression of crossing boundaries. “Nature is one, and the only

gap that can be recognized without doubt, seems to be one between man and animals”, writes Wieczorkiewicz (2010: 76), as if expressing a centuries-long conviction of people about their own qualitative difference from the rest of the living world. However, if Ivanovich’s experiment had succeeded, these boundaries would be false, and thus our ethical doubts unfounded. These experiments fit in with a long history of thinking about what species are:

Are the species real or are they rather concepts imposed by the human mind on nature? These two solutions have for centuries pointed to different paths on which cognition and the ordering of knowledge about the surrounding world was made. Following the first path, one aims to place creatures and plants within categories that correspond to actual differences; the species are thus said to be natural. The second path makes us transform the concept of species into a set of arbitrary divisions (Wieczorkiewicz 2010: 152).

Ivanov’s experiment could have proven that the boundary between us and animals is not natural, but is an artificial construct that allows us to take from the animal world everything we need without restrictions. In that case, the boundary should be re-examined in favor of the animals. Today’s biotechnological achievements in human hybridization have undermined its existence. They have provided arguments for intellectuals opposed to species chauvinism and striving to give animals the status of *nonhuman persons*⁴. They also promote the abandonment of anthropocentric views in science and making a step towards post-humanism, whose main assumption is that man is not an isolated quality, separate from the rest of the world, as noted by Donna Haraway, among others:

We are in the midst of webbed existences, multiple beings in relationship, this animal, this sick child, this village, these herds, these labs, these neighborhoods in a city, these industries and economies, these ecologies linking natures and cultures without end (Haraway 2008: 72).

According to Monika Bakke, “anthropocentrism in many circles is seen not only as an unjustified position, but also as arrogant and anachronistic. However, we are only at the beginning of the road opening us to the world of the unknown, non-human other” (Bakke 2007:

⁴ For example, Peter Singer, Richard Ryder, Jane Godall, Steven M. Wise, Thomas I. White, Richard Dawkins, Tom Regan, Kirill Rossijanow.

232). One could suppose that the development of biotechnology and genetics will foster a further expansion of posthumanism.

Returning to Ivanov – the Academy of Sciences of the USSR stopped supporting him when it turned out that in his plans was also the insemination of African women with monkey semen, without their knowledge and consent. After his return from Africa, Ivanov was planning to conduct similar experiments in Sukhumi, for which several women volunteered. The reason Ivanov decided to conduct experiments on women, was that he had difficulties with breeding the monkeys, which quickly died of diseases and wrong diet in captivity. For the artificial insemination of women, much fewer animals were needed – only one or two males. Rossiânov discovered a paradox in the perception of this part of Ivanov’s experiments by scholars at the time:

[On the one hand, the plans for carrying out experiments in Sukhumi fit with the general trend of the politics of women’s emancipation (...). On the other hand, experiments in which the hybrid mother is a woman, evidently raise a larger indignation in us than the same experiments in which the female chimpanzee acts as the mother. But why? This question inevitably arises if we actually believe that a man and woman bear equal responsibility for their offspring. Why does the human – although only half-human being – given birth to by an ape, carrying human genes passed down by the father-human move our “natural” feelings less than a hybrid born to a woman?] (Rossiânov 2006).

What would be the appearance of a human and monkey hybrid mean to the world? For Ivanov and his contemporaries, it would be a triumph of science, and specifically, of Soviet science free from prejudices. And very likely, nothing more because, like Rossiânov says, nowhere in the archives is there even an allusion to the possibility of further study of hybrids. It seems that its appearance was not meant to be a means to something, but an end in itself. How characteristic of the “Picasso’s of laboratories” that Rostand was in awe of: to cross the boundaries established by nature, to create new creatures. The fact that nature itself had not created such beings, did not mean that it was impossible. Ivanov’s planned experiment of inseminating female volunteers with monkeys’ semen failed due to the death of the animals in captivity. Ivanov was arrested shortly after the arrival of a new party of monkeys. He died two years later as a result of a stroke. Were Ivanov’s experiment a success (although it could not –

because of the different number of human and ape chromosomes, which was not known at the time), he would have shown our closeness to the animal world much earlier than biotechnology has.

Rossiânov examines the problem of the unethicity of creating human-animal hybrids from a new angle and asks the question: maybe it is the monkeys (or other species of animals) that need protection against human urges? Maybe we should be looking at the crossbreeding of humans and animals from a wider perspective of respecting other species? Such a presentation of the issue not only fits into the posthumanistic approach to human relations with other animals, but it also constitutes a defensible argument against Ivanov's experiments.

[Crossbreeding with humans may also appear as unacceptable abuse: monkeys are sufficiently well-developed intellectually, but, like children, they cannot make responsible decisions on their own. And apparently respect and solidarity with another species requires a resignation from imposing our genes, the renunciation of an unacceptable "expansion", occupation of a territory, which does not belong to the human. The ban will be ethically substantiated, not because of our selfish interest here, but the respect for "someone else's" good] (Rossiânov 2006).

Creating a hybrid in the way that Ivanov chose is impossible due to differences in the number of chromosomes between humans and primates. However, genetic engineering makes it possible today to create such a hybrid in other ways, therefore the issue of the ethicality of Ivanov's experiments and the status of the being which was to be born from his experiment, is a very current problem for science in the 21st century.

Contemporary state of biotechnological research

In contemporary discussions on the development of biotechnology, both in scientific circles as well as among non-specialists, very different approaches to scientific achievements of the last decades can be traced – from euphoria to an apocalyptic technogenic vision of the future. We are afraid of moving boundaries, "playing God", breaking the laws of nature, but also ourselves – children that were given access to dangerous toys. Science and technology are ascribed extreme possibilities: the salvation of mankind from disease, famine and an ecological catastrophe, or just the contrary – accelerating the catastrophe, create something (artificial

intelligence, deadly virus) which will destroy our entire species. Science often undergoes personification in these ideas, becoming a force that works independently.

Radkowska-Walkowicz writes:

From a contemporary perspective, there are three basic types of looking at technology. The first one has gnostic roots. According to it, technology has great power, it spreads to all spheres of life regardless of us. It is God or the Devil. According to the second perspective, technology itself cannot have any power over us. It remains a tool in the hands of people. The human is strong, and technology is only a means to make his power even stronger. The third perspective combines the first two (...) technology is always a step behind our imagination. There is no such power that we wish to see in it and it is not as subdued as we would like it to be. It is not cheating us, but we are cheating ourselves with it (Radkowska-Walkowicz 2008: 81-82).

The modern scientist may then take on the form of Faustus, who for the realization of scientific purposes sold his soul to the devil; Frankenstein, whose ambition, curiosity and willingness to be useful to people, led him to create a monster; he may be a merciless, mad Doctor Moreau or a cultured and rational doctor Preobrazhensky – the choice of character seems to have no limits. The cultural topo of the researcher has a great influence on the language and attitudes seen in the debates on biotechnologies. Undoubtedly, the most widely used one is the “scientific myth” about Frankenstein (Turney 1998).

Wieczorkiewicz (2010: 144-146), in her analysis of approaches to monsters over the centuries, comes to the conclusion that in every age, there is a certain dominant attitude, and the oppositions in the emotional relationship to monsters are delight and repulsion, or in other words – admiration and horror. The dominant attitude influences the “perspective of cultural existence” of monsters in a given period. In the period of the modern collectors of peculiarities, it was delight, while in Voltaire’s time it was rather repulsion. These perspectives of looking at peculiarities in the world of living beings determine a dominant discourse in a given period, pushing the remaining ways of understanding them to the margin, however, without removing them completely.

Let us replace for a moment the monster that the researcher writes about, with human-animal hybrids and chimeras. All the more so that hybrids and chimeras, undoubtedly have in them something monstrous, because they are also “characteristically ambiguous” and belong to

two worlds simultaneously. Everything points to the fact that the current discourse is close to delight and admiration, rather than to monstrosity/hybridism. Regardless of the serious fears and apocalyptic visions of the “end of man”, the prevailing mood is biotechnological optimism. A continuous extension of what is allowed in genetic experiments may be proof of this (among European countries, the UK is at its forefront).

Contemporary scientific research in the field of chimerization and hybridization are already very advanced. Human-animal chimeras and hybrids are created with the use of different methods and employ a wide spectrum of biotechnological manipulation, both with regard to sex cells, embryos, and developed organisms – both prenatally and postnatally⁵.

The Danish Ethics Council published a report on the ethical aspects of scientific research in the field of human and animal hybrids and chimeras in 2010. There are three areas of experiments that are already underway. The first area is a transplant of human embryonic stem cells or nerve cells into primates’ brains (in embryos and adult individuals), as transplants of parts of the brain. The second area is the transplantation of tissues and germ line embryonic stem cells⁶ to early embryos, which can lead to the production of human embryos in the animal body and vice versa. The third area concerns experiments in which hybrids are created by means of fertilizing human and animal sex cells, as well as by combining the blastocysts (the early embryonic stage) of humans and animals (*Man or Mouse?* ... 2010: 97).

Beck describes the creation of human and animal hybrids as a connection of an animal egg cell deprived of a nucleus with the nucleus of any human cell (the Dolly sheep cloning method). A series of experiments involving human and cow (or rabbit) biological material was performed in this way. In the case of the transfer of the cell nucleus, the animal’s (mitochondrial) and the human’s (nuclear) genetic material are in a relation of 0,1% to 99,9%. The phenotype of the hybrid (internal and external characteristics of the organism) will be defined by the human genome. Beck (2009: 87) warns that animal egg cells have a low capacity to reprogram⁷, which in many cases leads to the death of the hybrid embryo or to incorrect gene expression. Chinese researcher Ying Chen has been able to reach the blastocyst stadium of cell development in his

⁵ In the first case, the issue is the introduction of human stem cells into animal egg cells, as well as the introduction of human genetic material into animal embryos, while postnatal experiments consist in transplanting cells, tissues and organs between organisms.

⁶ The issue are cells in the early stages of blastocyst development (the bubble that is the result of the cellular division of zygotes) that have the ability to differentiate into all other cell types (pluripotency).

⁷ The reversal of epigenetic changes affecting the activity of individual genes, which makes the cell work as it used to at its earlier stages of development.

experiment of crossing a human nucleus with the egg cell of a rabbit, which in Beck's view, creates a need to seriously think about the possibility of creating a live hybrid, with all of its consequences.

The aim of the experiments that is declared by scientists with regard to creating human-animal hybrid embryos using of the Dolly sheep cloning method is not the creation of a new live organism, but to acquire the possibility to conduct personalized therapies of diseases, such as Parkinson's disease. Earlier, stem cells were acquired in a way where the cell nucleus of any healthy cell of the patient was implanted into a human egg cell, and after its reprogramming, it was possible to obtain stem cells that matched the patient perfectly (the embryo would undergo destruction in this process). Such a therapy, however, raises a number of ethical, medical and legal concerns at all stages: starting with financial ones, through the possible risks for the egg donor, to the problem of creating an embryo exclusively for therapeutic purposes. Hence, the idea of creating a non-human embryo (with an animal cell and human DNA) from which you can get human stem cells. However, the ethicality of such an approach also requires a detailed consideration.

Beck sees a number of dangers related to such experiments. She underlines the fact that human stem cells obtained from hybrid embryos may contain the mitochondrial genetic material of the animal, as well as that all of the clones are "sick", and the hybrid clones from the egg of the animal even more so, because of their low reprogramming capabilities. Moreover, there is a danger of transplanting pathogens that are typical for animals to the human body. All of this, according to the researcher, proves that the term "therapeutic cloning" should not be used with regard to the method of creating human-animal hybrids through combining the animal egg cell deprived of the nucleus with the nucleus of any human cell, and that such experiments belong to the field of basic, not applied, sciences. This is the root cause of Beck's criticism addressed at former British Prime Minister, Gordon Brown, who in his letter to the European Commission argued for the legal consent for such research in his country, referring to the possibility to save thousands of people's lives (Beck 2009: 89-90).

Chimeras may be people with animal cells or organs. The situation is simpler than in the case hybrids, because it is easier to draw a line between what is and what is not human. Studies on chimeras include, among other things, experiments on the brain. Beck gives the example of transplanting human stem cells to the brains of monkeys. The stated purpose of the experiment

was to investigate treatments of Parkinson's and Alzheimer's disease, however, one can imagine that the scientists were also driven by their curiosity about how such a transplant can impact the intellect of these beings. Especially that Beck points to this indirectly herself, recalling the experiments of transplanting quail brain cells to the developing brains of chicken. The chicken, after hatching, displayed behavior typical of quails. According to the author, monkeys, to whom human brain cells are implanted in their embryonic state, could theoretically become more intelligent. However, the monkeys taking part in the experiment did not become more intelligent, but instead died as a result of tumors after the transplant (Beck 2009).

Another example of creating a human and animal chimera is given by the German scientist. Human stem cells were inserted into the embryos of a sheep in the womb. These embryos developed normally and up to 15% of their cells changed into human cells. In this case, the question arises whether these cells could also develop into human gametes. If so, then it would be possible, theoretically, to use them to create human stem cells.

Beck also theorizes about the possible, although so far not performed, implantation of animal genes into a human embryo in order to transfer the animal's traits onto the human. This technology could prove successful, as embryos do not have an immune system capable of rejecting the implant. Such a possibility of "improving" the human is also pointed to by Lee Silver:

If something has evolved elsewhere, then it is *possible* for us to determine its genetic basis and transfer it into the human genome. Relatively simple animal attributes that fall into this category include the ability to see into the ultraviolet range of the infrared range—which would greatly enhance a person's night vision. Other possibilities include light-emitting organs (from fireflies and fish), generators of electricity (from eels), and magnetic detection systems (from birds). More sophisticated animal attributes include the ability to distinguish and interpret thousands of different airborne molecules present at incredibly low levels (through the enhanced sense of smell available to dogs and other mammals), and the ability to generate and sense reflected high frequency sound waves to "see" objects in complete darkness through a biological sonar system (by bats) (Silver 1998: 278-279).

The researcher is convinced that "the human species will gain control over its own destiny" (Silver 1998: 152). Because the goal of such practices clearly goes beyond therapy and is a classic example of genetic human enhancement, so far, there are no legal premises allowing for

the performance of such experiments. However, interest in them is high and they are being widely discussed in scientific circles. There is no doubt that technologies developed for therapeutic purposes bring knowledge and skills that can be later used to genetically “enhance” humans.

Transgenic animals may also be considered human-animal chimeras. They are animals part of whose genes are human. These organisms are used for, for example, diagnosing patients and testing drugs. An example of a transgenic animal (chimera) is the oncomouse⁸: a mouse genetically susceptible to oncological diseases. There are many other similar animals, such as cows, goats and sheep that produce human enzymes together with their milk, and even bacteria that produce, for example, insulin.

There are many disputes concerning the creation of transgenic animals, not only those which have human genes. It is emphasized that the breeding of such animals is expensive and not very effective, as only a small part of the thousands of embryos is successfully bred. These animals are often sick, some of them are incapable of reproduction, and it happens that instead of an expected result, a different one is developed in the animal, which impedes the normal development of the desired trait (like in the case of the pig with the human growth hormone). Apart from the ethical issue, the question arises whether an uncertain experiment result justifies harming animals. A number of other concerns also arises. Transgenic animals carrying the gene of a particular disease, in the event of infiltrating the natural environment, could start to reproduce, which could theoretically lead to the mutation or spreading of new diseases on a scale that is hard to imagine. Moreover, it is a new way of using animals and treating them as beings whose life’s only value is their utility to humans and does not constitute a value on its own.

Xenotransplantation: ethical and technical aspects

Xenotransplantation means the transplant of organs, cells or tissues between organisms of different biological species. In the case of humans, it is any procedure that involves the transplantation, implantation or infusion of living cells, tissue or organs of animals, as well as human body fluids, cells, tissue or organs that have entered into contact with cells, tissue or organs of animals *ex vivo*. Xenotransplantation is an attempt to solve the problem of the acute

⁸ The subject of the oncomouse was elaborated by D. Haraway (1997)

deficit of organs for transplantation. Of course, it is controversial technology, not only from a medical, but also from an ethical perspective. Leaving to the side problems on the axis of donor – recipient that allotransplantation⁹ brings, new spheres of problems have arisen.

First of all, it should be emphasized that xenotransplantation is not a safe technology. Regardless of the seemingly obvious advantage of the availability of organs for transplantation (which still remains a disputable issue), xenotransplantation entails many risks, both for the individual patient and for all of humanity (for example, the problem of identity that may arise in the patient or the risk of transferring animal diseases to humans).

In the case of allotransplantation, the transplanted organ is part of another man. Although the donor usually remains anonymous, the recipient receives a minimum of information (gender and age). Based on this data, they often make up a whole story, and it often happens that they look for signs of identity or character of the person whose organ they received in themselves. It can be assumed that what is at work here is the principle of magical action by contact, the so-called, magic of contact (J.G. Frazer's in classification): "things which have once been in contact with each other continue to act on each other at a distance after the physical contact has been severed" (Frazer 1994: 27). It happens that when a person receives a heart, liver or kidney from another man, they are convinced that together with this organ, they received something else: habits, sympathies and fears of the donor, or some features of their behavior and character. So the question arises, what could be the feelings of a man who received an animal organ? Will they have problems with their identity? Or will they somehow feel "inferior" compared to "one-hundred-per-cent" people? It is widely believed, however, that faced with a choice: of receiving an animal organ or death, the choice in favor of life is natural and obvious.

John Paul II, who accepted transplants, said the following about their ethical aspect:

Each organ transplant has its source in a decision of great ethical value, namely the decision to offer for free part of the person's own body for the health and well-being of another person. The nobility of such a gesture lies in the fact that it is a true act of

⁹ Transplantation within the same species.

love. It is not a question of donation of something that belongs to us, but of donating part of ourselves¹⁰.

In the case of the donor-animal there is no consideration of such a “gift”, of sacrifice and generosity, instead, there is the murder of a strong, healthy animal in order to save the sick man. This causes objections of animal rights protectors, regardless of the fact that the objective seems to be morally superior than murder in order to satisfy your appetite. The animal can be used here as a living storage room of organs or spare body parts. And that means that xenotransplantation, with all of its attractiveness, as a way of solving the problem of the deficit of organs for transplantation, is not a “clean” technology, devoid of ethical problems.

As for the technical aspect of xenotransplantation, the animals most suitable for human organ transplantation are pigs. Initially scientists have tried to use primate tissue and organs, being the evolutionarily closest animals to humans, but they were confronted with certain difficulties. Firstly, the primates’ organs usually differ from human organs in size, which narrows down the possibility of a transplant. Secondly, primates suffer from diseases and are carriers of viruses which could be easily transmitted to the recipient. Thirdly, just like people, primates reproduce slowly: their pregnancy lasts a long time and they usually give birth to one offspring, making it difficult to obtain the necessary amount of organs for transplantation. The breeding of pigs has proven to be much more favorable in this regard. Some pig organs are anatomically and physiologically very similar to human organs, breeding is cheaper and simpler compared with the breeding of primates, and they reproduce much faster. When it comes to the phylogenetic distance, the transfer of diseases from pig to human is much less likely, although not impossible. In the case of pigs there exists, however, a major immunological barrier, which may result in the rejection of transplanted organs. In order to solve this problem, scientists from around the world (among them also the creator of Dolly the sheep) are trying to breed transgenic pigs, which would have genes eliminating this barrier¹¹. Many transgenic are pigs successfully grown in numerous laboratories around the world, which allows one to believe that the immunological barrier may be

¹⁰ Quote of the message of John Paul II to participants of the International Congress of the Transplantation, *Zespół Opieki zdrowotnej w Chełmnie – Transplantologia*, http://www.zoz.chelmno.pl/zoz/index.php?option=com_content&task=blogsection&id=32&Itemid=88 (26.11.2012).

¹¹ One way to overcome or reduce the immunological barrier is to include human genes into the genome of the donor pig. Therefore, a transgenic animal is formed, the human-animal chimera, in order to eventually create another chimera – a man with the organ of an animal.

eliminated. But even if transgenic pigs, prove themselves as organ donors, from a medical point of view, there are still many ethical problems standing in the way of realizing the eternal dream of humankind – of the renewability of the human body and the extension of life.

Xenotransplantation: a short historical overview

The first documented case xenotransplantation was reported in Russia in 1682, when a surgeon rebuilt the damaged skull of a nobleman with a fragment of a dog's skull. The surgery was successful, but the Orthodox Church threatened the man with exclusion, had he not gotten rid of the implant (Kuźmicz 2009; Wojcik, 2007: 312). Another example of xenotransplantation is the transplantation of frog's skin, used in the treatment of burn patients at the end of nineteenth century (Kuzmich 2009). Further experiments in this field were related to findings by the doctors Charles Edouard Brown-Séquard, who subcutaneously injected patients with a solution from fresh guinea pig and dog testicles, and Sergei Voronov, who continued these experiments using the nuclei and glands of other animals. These experiments (which both medics also conducted on themselves) were aimed at the rejuvenation of the body.

In turn, in the 1920s, a doctor from the Californian San Quentin prison, L.L. Stanley, conducted a series of ethically questionable experiments in order to renew the “life energy” in elderly patients by transplanting gonads of cattle and criminals that underwent execution to them (Liśuk 2011).

In the 1960s, the animals most closely related humans – primates, started to be used in inter-species transplantation. As I have already mentioned, it was the phylogenetic closeness that seemed to be the main argument in favor of those transplants. Kidneys, hearts and livers of chimpanzees and baboons were transplanted to adults and children; only one patient survived nine months, the rest died within weeks, days, or even hours of the transplant. This type of operations could be justified in cases where the patient's condition did not allow for a long wait, but the widely known case of “Baby Fae” in many respects appears to be an example of unethical procedure and simply of experimentation on humans. In 1984 Leonard L. Bailey performed the transplant of a baboon's heart to a newborn girl (later called Baby Fae) with hypoplastic left heart syndrome¹², which at the time was incurable. The important thing is that a heart was also

¹² Congenital heart disease involving abnormal formation of the left ventricle

available from a human donor – the heart of another newborn child, which would give a higher chance of survival to Baby Fae than xenotransplantation suggested by the doctor. Although the operation itself was successful, the girl died 21 days later, filling the sad statistics of xenotransplantation patients¹³.

In 1995, Suzanne Ildstad transplanted baboon bone marrow cells to an AIDS patient, Jeff Getty, hoping that AIDS-resistant baboon stem cells would help the patient's bone marrow to produce cells fighting the disease (Altman 1995)¹⁴. Although formally the operation was successful, the baboon cells soon disappeared from the body of the patient. However, his condition not only did not deteriorate, but it even improved, and no trace of viruses transmitted from the baboon could be found in the patient's body, which the medical community feared most. Xenotransplantation did not help Jeff Getty cure AIDS – he died in 2006, as a result of heart failure, which was a result of the disease (Łęski 1999).

Since the 1990s, there has been a shift away from using phylogenetically close primates in xenotransplantation in favor of using pigs as donors. One of the non-medical factors that favored this shift were animal rights protests against the killing of primates. As they are bred for meat, pigs as organ donors create much less controversy and sharp social reactions.

The positions of the world's religions regarding xenotransplantation are not clearly defined. With the exception of Buddhism and Hinduism, in which there is a completely different approach to inter-species boundaries compared to the Judeo-Christian world. They leave the decision to the conscience of the believers. The greatest world religions are not opposed to interspecies transplantation, arguing that people have the right to use nature for their benefit. In this context, the problem is the ban on using pork in Judaism and Islam. As Zdzisław Smorąg writes:

both Islam and Judaism prohibit eating the meat of these animals. However, organ transplants of porcine origin are not treated as an act of consumption of such meat, but as a way of obtaining a significant benefit from the use of this animal species (Smorąg 2006: 109).

¹³ *The case of Baby Fae - comment*,

<http://www.incet.uj.edu.pl/dzialy.php?l=pl&p=31&i=3&m=26&n=2z=0&&kk=76k=63> (28.1.2013).

¹⁴ See. Also *Laboratoria innowacyjnych biomedycznych technologii*, <http://www.limbt.com/page/25> (02.09.2016).

Note, however, that both in Islam and Judaism there is no superior religious authority, and local religious leaders interpret the scriptures with some degree of freedom and determine what is allowed and what is not, while a clearly expressed restriction was formulated by the Catholic Church, which is associated with the identity of the human recipient of animal organs. The Papal Academy, in the document “Pro Vita” in 2001 specifies that there are two types of organs: functional and those affecting identity (the brain and sex organs belong to this category). Thus, to avoid the risk of blurring the border between man and animal or the violation of human identity, only functional organs can be subject to xenotransplantation (Wójcik, 2007: 315).

Currently, intensive research on the technology, which can be called “reversed xenotransplantation” is being conducted: it is the cultivation of human organs in the bodies of animals for later transplantation to human recipients. Therefore, an animal chimera is created first, which carries in it a human heart, liver, or other organ, which is then transplanted to a human body. The human organs in the animal body are grown from stem cells implanted into animal embryos. This technology reduces the risk of organ rejection and allows for the creation of organs of a particular patient. However, it is not free from problems of ethical nature. In addition to the above-mentioned concerns regarding the right to experiment and kill animals, there arises an important question about the possibility of a biological “humanization” of the animal. Theoretically, it is possible that a brain instead of a liver will grow out of the stem cells. The question about our right to biological expansion and a kind of “colonization” of other species arise (which Rossiânov mentioned in a slightly different context).

The risks associated with the development of biotechnology

The above examples of historical and contemporary experiments show that the topic of human-animal hybrids and chimeras has attracted scientists for centuries. They now have the tools that are necessary for their creation. Therefore, the fear of losing “human nature” and self-destruction of man appears. There is fear that the world will be dominated by robots, or “posthumans” – for example hybrids – that do not share a common biology with modern humans, understood here primarily as a carrier of our mental, moral and spiritual component. As argued by Wiczorkiewicz who studies creatures and monsters among the human species, in the general perception, peculiarities of the body affect the senses, and these, in turn, affect morality. Fear for

the body is therefore simultaneously fear for the soul. It is perfectly reflected at the level of academic debate in the increased interest in so-called “moral enhancement”, as opposed to the broader term “human enhancement”.

It is now possible to talk about different levels of research in the field of creating human-animal hybrids and chimeras: they are experiments on cells and tissue, prenatal and postnatal. Each poses different questions and ethical challenges. The biggest impact on the change of the concept of “human nature” is made by experiments (both real and hypothetical), which can be classified as follows: 1. Improvement of humans with the use of animal genes, i.e., the creation of humans with an “addition” of animal genetic material; 2. The addition of human genes or organs to animals, for example in order to carry out further experiments or receive body tissues with human features; 3. The creation of a new hybrid organism whose classification is ambiguous.

Because modern science allows us to create a real “human-animal”, it becomes necessary to prepare for such a scenario and to consider a number of ethical issues. Such problems arise at every stage of research in this area, starting with the pragmatic level, associated with legal issues. It concerns determining the permissible boundaries and goals of experiments involving hybrids and chimeras. At the same time, it should be taken into account that they are not always easy to delineate, for example, in the case of “medical” goals, we can speak of both therapeutic and “enhancement” ones. And so, is the addition of the ability to regenerate lost limbs still treatment? Or is it enhancement? Achievements in one area may also lead to unintended effects in other areas, for example in the military field.

Another sphere of legal problems is the patenting of research results. Biotechnologists work with genes and these are found in nature. Can one register a patent for adding, reducing or transferring genes? Would it limit the rights of those who carry these genes in them (in the case of human genes)? Beck (2009: 40) asks whether a mouse with one human gene differs in this respect from mice with thousands of human genes. She also asks whether it is sufficient to patent such an animal once, or whether the addition of each new gene will be considered as a new achievement each time. Besides, can you patent genes at all? After all, they are not an invention, but a discovery. Patenting advances in biotechnology may lead to the monopolization of this sphere, and this can affect the lives of people in a cardinal way. It is related directly to the problem of access and the regulation of technology in society. If they are regulated in accordance

with the principles of the free market, they could cause profound and irreversible social stratification according to socio-economic criteria: the rich would be able to “program” desirable traits in their offspring, and less wealthy people would be deprived of this possibility. The indirect effect of this may also be the lack of medication and even of research on drugs for diseases that the rich could “turn off” in their genes, as production of such drugs would not be profitable for pharmaceutical companies. Silver (1998) suggests that, over time, genetically modified (*Genrich*) people will cease to have offspring with “Naturals”, which will lead to the division of *Homo sapiens* into two different species. An excellent pop-cultural illustration of the discrimination of genetically unchanged people in society is the movie *Gattaca*. The regulation of biotechnology by the state, on the other hand, creates the risk of totalitarianism which develops people with specific characteristics, according to the state’s needs: soldiers, workers, scientists, athletes, and so on.

Focusing public attention on genetics may also lead to abuse with regard to the protection of personal genetic data. This is a serious problem, which will primarily be reflected in the insurance system, and which may, with time, become the basis for genetic discrimination.

Significant ethical problems associated with the emergence of the “human-animal” – a human with a significant addition of animal genes or tissue, an animal with an addition of human material, or a new form of life that is hard to define unambiguously. What comes to the foreground in this case is the problem of the status of such a creature, or its “dignity”, which Beck (2009) understands as the right to the protection of their inviolability, autonomy, and individual freedom. How will the emergence of human-animal hybrids or chimeras impact society in philosophical and religious terms? What will be the status of these new beings in society and how will the relationship with their environment look like? Depending on the physical and mental characteristics of the hybrid or chimerical creature, all sorts of scenarios are possible.

Another type of ethical issues is in line with the broad trend of experiments involving humans or human biological material. As in the case of assisted reproductive technology, here there are ethical concerns regarding the participation of gamete and genetic material donors, and the use of human embryos or their cells.

Regardless of the multitude of risks and problems associated with the development of biotechnology, one should not expect that research in the area will be stopped.

Practice shows that it is difficult to stop the development of science, and the inconsistency of legislation in different countries and regions of the world only causes the migration of scientists to countries with liberal laws. We can even observe a peculiar biotechnological race. As already mentioned, the most liberal country in this regard in Europe is the United Kingdom, which, regardless of the existence of strong ethical control of experiments, allows for more scientific freedom than Germany, shackled in experiences of Nazism, or Catholic countries, limited by the influence of religion in the sphere of science.

In this context, it seems necessary to present the problems of biotechnology related to the “enhancement” of the human to the general public who are not experts in the field of bioethics and biotechnology. The presentation of the subject should not take the form of a techno-utopia, nor the contrary, a catastrophic scenario of the future. Instead, it should provide accurate information and guidance for further discussions, which in turn will shape public opinion and new legislation in biotechnology. Only in this way can societies direct the achievements of modern “disenchanted” techno-science in a responsible, aware and open way.

REFERENCES

- Altman L.K.
1995 *Man Gets Baboon Marrow in Risky AIDS Treatment*, „The New York Times”, 5.12.1995, <http://www.nytimes.com/1995/12/15/us/man-gets-baboon-marrow-in-risky-aids-treatment.html> (02.09.2016).
- Bakke M.
2007 *Między nami zwierzętami. O emocjonalnych związkach między ludźmi i innymi zwierzętami*, „Teksty Drugie” 1-2, pp. 222-234, <http://rcin.org.pl/dlibra/doccontent?id=51065> (12.07.2016).
- Beck M.
2009 *Mensch-Tier-Wesen. Zur ethischen Problematik von Hybriden, Chimaren, Parthenoten*, Paderborn: Ferdinand Schoeningh.
- Dąbrowska M.
2012 *Psy rasowe jako bio-dzieło sztuki?*, „Artmix” 28 (18), <http://archiwum-obieg.u-jazdowski.pl/artmix/24243> (20.07.2016).
- Frazer J.G.
1994 *The Golden Bough: A study in magic and religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gajewska G.
2012 *Przyroda(i)kultura w epoce antropocenu*, „Przestrzenie Teorii” 17, pp. 105-114.
- Haraway D.
1997 *Modest_Witness@Second_Millennium.Female_Manc_Meets_Oncomouse™: Feminism and Technoscience*, New York and London: Routledge.

- 2008 *When Species Meet*, Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hartman J.
2002 *Czym jest dzisiaj bioetyka?*, „Archeus” 3, pp. 5-15, http://www.iphils.uj.edu.pl/~j.hartman/pu.php?c=bioetyka&p=czym_jest_dzisiaj_bioetyka (14.07.2016).
- Koževnikova M.
2013 *Granicy człowieka w kontekście stworzenia himer człowieka i zwierzęcego*, in: E.B. Barinova (ed.), *Kulturnye granicy i granicy v kulture, Materialy konferencii molodyh uchenykh*, Moskva: IEA RAN, pp.164-170.
- 2015 *Gibridy i himery człowieka i zwierzęcego w nauce: historia i współczesne badania*, in: S.V. Sokolovskij (ed.), *Innovacii v antropologii: novye napravleniia, ob"ekty i metody v rossijskikh antropologičeskikh issledovaniiah*, Moskva: IEA RAN (e-book), pp. 14-34.
- 2016a *Gibridizacja i himeryzacja jak human enhancement: określenie „przyrody człowieka” w jakości instrumenta integracji*, in: S.M. Klimova, A.D. Majdanskij (eds), *Koncepcii postczłowieka w filozofii i w technice: Materialy V Meždunarodnoj naučnoj školy dla molodeži*, Belgorod: ID Belgorod NIU BelGU, pp. 44-50.
- 2016b *Gibridnyj człowiek przyszłości: o zagrożeniu „przyrody człowieka”*, in: N.D. Subbotina, O.A. Borisenko (eds), *Problema sootnošeniia estestvennogo i social'nogo v obščestve i v čeloveke: materialy VII Meždunarodnoj naučnoj konf.*, Čita: ZabGU, pp. 215-229.
- Kuźmicz J.Z.
2009 *Ogólne aspekty ksenotransplantacji*, <http://www.biotechnolog.pl/artykul-225.htm> (30.01.2013).
- Liśuk O.
2011 *Rentabel'naabesčelovečnost'*, <http://medportal.ru/mednovosti/main/2011/02/28/experiments/> (30.01.2013).
- Łęski T.
1999 *Serce prosto od świni*, „Wiedza i Życie” 1, <http://archiwum.wiz.pl/1999/99013800.asp> (02.09.2016).
- Man or Mouse...*
2010 *Man or Mouse? Ethical Aspects of Chimera Research. Report*, Copenhagen: The Danish Council of Ethics.
- Radkowska-Walkowicz M.
2008 *Od Golema do Terminatora. Wizerunki sztucznego człowieka w kulturze*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Rosiński K.O.
2006 *Opasnye svazi: I. I. Ivanov i opyty skrešivaniâ čeloveka s čelovekoobraznymi obez'ânami*, „Voprosy istorii estestvoznaniâ i tehniki” 1, <http://vivovoco.Rsl.ru/VV/PAPERS/ECCE/IVAPITEK.HTM> (15.07.2016).
- Rostand J.
1964 *Biologia twórcza*, przeł. A. Steinsberg, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Silver L.
1998 *Remaking Eden: How Genetic Engineering and Cloning Will Transform the American Family*. New York: Avon Books.

- Smorąg Z.
2006 *Biotechnologiczne, prawno-organizacyjne i etyczne aspekty ksenotransplantacji*, „Biotechnologia” 1 (72), pp. 103-109,
http://www.pfb.info.pl/files/kwartalnik/1_2006/Smorag.pdf (2.09.2016).
- Smorąg Z., Słomski R.
2005 *Ksenotransplantacja – możliwości i ograniczenia*, „Nauka” 4, pp. 133-148.
- Tišenko P.D.
2001 *Bio-vlast’ v èpohu biotehnologii*, Moskva: IF RAN.
- Turney J.
1998 *Frankenstein’s Footsteps: Science, genetics, and popular culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Vaal’ de F.
2014 *Istoki morali: w poskakh čelovečeskogo u primatov*, Moskva: Alpina non-fi kšn.
- Wieczorkiewicz A.
2010 *Monstruarium*, Gdańsk: Słowo/obraz terytoria.
- Wójcik B.
2007 *Ksenotransplantacje*, in: A. Muszala (ed.), *Encyklopedia bioetyki*, Radom: Polskie Wydawnictwo Encyklopedyczne, pp. 312-316.

Internet sources:

Kazus Baby Fae – komentarz, <http://www.incet.uj.edu.pl/dzialy.php?l=pl&p=31&i=3&m=26&n=2&z=0&kk=76&k=63> (28.01.2013).

Zespół opieki zdrowotnej w Chełmnie – Transplantologia, http://www.zoz.chelmno.pl/zoz/index.php?option=com_content&task=blogsection&id=32&Itemid=88 (26.11.2012).

Laboratoria innovacionnyh biomedicinskih tehnologij, <http://www.limbt.com/page/25> (02.09.2016).

JACEK NOWAK
Institute of Sociology
Jagiellonian University, Cracow

JEWISH NEIGHBOURS. SOCIAL TIES AS RECALLED BY INHABITANTS OF SOUTHERN POLAND

Introduction

“When poverty strikes, see a Jew”, says the Polish proverb. Proverbs describing mutual relations were widely circulated and concerned many spheres of life, which testifies to the importance of these intercultural contacts. The direct suggestion contained in this proverb is only seemingly legible: “a Jew will help in poverty”, while in reality it may have had a hidden, negative association with the stereotype of “Jew-exploiter”. In this article I deal with the question of remembering Polish-Jewish relations, with particular emphasis on the character of the neighborhood ties.

My analysis is defined by three key concepts: neighborhood relations, relations with Jews and memory of the past. The subject of the analysis are the recollections that we gathered during research conducted in 1988-1993 at the Department of Social Anthropology of the Institute of Sociology at Jagiellonian University. They were conducted as part of the project “Memory of Jewish culture among the inhabitants of Podkarpackie Province” lead by Andrzej Paluch and Jonathan Webber (Oxford University). The project covered selected towns and villages in the entire area of former Galicia in Poland, from Bielsko-Biała to the country’s eastern border. Places that are important for Jewish culture were selected, e.g., Bobowa, Leżajsk, Dąbrowa Tarnowska, or Rymanów. Some towns were also selected *ad hoc*, based on the gathered information about the former relations of Jews with non-Jews. In total, four-hundred interviews were conducted in dozens locations in the region. These conversations were recorded and transcribed, to be later digitized after over ten years¹. Qualitative research was conducted using semi-structured in-depth interviews over a period of several years by several teams. Although the interview scenario was

¹ The Institute of Sociology at the Jagiellonian University is the trustee of the interviews.

flexible, in line with the method used, and was subject to modifications over time, it focused mainly on issues of memory about Jewish culture. The questions were grouped into several thematic blocks on the following issues: general remarks about the Jewish community; memories of its religion and rituals, memories of the relationship between Jews and non-Jews; memories of the Holocaust and stereotypes. For the purpose of this analysis, I have read all the interviews and have chosen content pertaining mainly to the memories of the relationship between Jews and non-Jews, with particular emphasis on questions directly related to the issue of neighborhood: “Is it good that Jews lived in your village?”, “If you could choose, who would make the best neighbor (a Jew, German, Ukrainian, Russian, Czech, or someone else)?”, and “What good and/or bad qualities do Jews have?”. As visible in the quoted fragments of the interviews, the interlocutors also related to other issues concerning culture and Polish-Jewish relations in their statements. Such thread mixing is characteristic of narratives about the past acquired in qualitative research. In the interviews, the interviewees act as witnesses recalling remembered events, formulating their interpretations and evaluations.

It should be provided that I am referring to a certain awareness of the interlocutors, their random observations, individual experiences and opinions, in which they often did not tell the truth, or perpetuated existing stereotypes. The respondents were mainly residents of selected villages who remembered the times before World War II. It is thus worth bearing in mind that the memories recalled come from their childhood or early youth. This means that we are dealing with ethnographic material that is an image of the past. A detailed description of some methodological issues concerning the analysis of these memories can be found in Sławomir Kaprański’s article (2015) – one of the few texts related to the materials collected during this study. Additionally, one should take into account the influence of memory interference connected with the historical policy of the People’s Republic of Poland or social ideas about Jewish culture. The period in which the study was conducted is also significant to the content of the recalled memories. The 1990s were the beginning of freeing of memory that was so far hidden and suppressed. Moreover, memories of Jews began to appear in the media and were the subject of discussions in the public sphere, which most likely affected the recalled memories of the respondents.

While the results of a similar study by Alina Cała (1992), conducted twenty years earlier, have already entered into sociological analysis, and the image of Jews captured in them was often

commented on, later studies, to which I refer, have not yet been discussed. This article is another attempt at showing how the residents of the towns and villages of this region reconstructed their memories about neighborhood relations, or rather, built their images of the past in this regard. Thus, I show the “remembered” character of these neighborhood relations, paying particular attention to the determinant influence of the community on memory in the evaluation of the neighborhood of Jews with non-Jews². This article is also a point of departure for further analyses that I am conducting together with my team as part of the project “In the footsteps of memory. Strategies of remembering Jewish culture in Galicia”³. We are interested in the methods and mechanisms of reprocessing memories of the Polish-Jewish past in intergenerational communication.

Memories of the Past

Before analyzing the issue of neighborhood relations, attention should be given to issues of remembering and forgetting the past. The material which we have at our disposal is a derivative of the community process of reprocessing memories about a period from several decades before. We conducted the interviews in the period of the beginning of the systemic transformation and the progressive democratization of memory, which permitted more and more boldly memories of the past that had so far been marginalized or forgotten (cf. Ziółkowski 2001). “Unleashed memories” became public and a subject of widespread debate. Many so far limited or hidden narratives of events from the past became the subject of research by historians, sociologists and anthropologists (Orla-Bukowska 2006). At the time, the phenomenon of collective memory was already being intensely studied in the scientific world. Maurice Halbwachs (1969), with his conception of social frameworks of memory, entered the scientific world for good, and the concept became an important reference point for researchers. Gradually, the published works began to revive the debate about the memory of the past in the social sciences, creating a kind of trend for these topics. David Lowenthal published *The Past is a Foreign Country* (1985), Jacques Le Goff – *History and Memory* (1992), followed shortly thereafter by an extensive work edited by Pierre Nora, *Realms of Memory* (Nora, ed., 1996-1998), more widely known by the original title: *Les lieux de memoire*. The work of Jan Assmann,

² The omission of the essential dichotomy “Poles versus Jews” for these relations is aimed at the intricate interpretation of identity issues related to ethno-cultural boundaries.

³ The project is financed by the National Science Centre, decision DEC-2012/07/B/HS3/03464.

Memory of Culture and Early Civilization (2011) also became important for later discussions on memory. The concepts, approaches and positions of Paul Ricoeur, Dominick LaCapra, Jeffrey Olick, Paul Connerton, and many others have often been invoked. The symbolic apogee of research on the memory of the past was the foundation of the journal “Memory Studies” by Sage Publishing in 2008.

In Poland, research on collective memory was initiated by Nina Assorodobraj, already in the 1960s. Among the sociologists continuing this research tradition are Barbara Szacka, Andrzej Szpociński and Lech Nijakowski. Naturally, the phenomenon of collective memory is also dealt with by representatives of other disciplines, such as historians, Marcin Kula and Robert Traba. Anthropologists have presented their approach extensively, for example, in the periodical “Konteksty. Polska Sztuka Ludowa”, headed by Katarzyna Kaniowska (2003), author of the article *Antropologia i problem pamięci*. From the anthropological point of view, the works of Joanna Tokarska-Bakir (e.g. 2004) are incredibly valuable for the issues discussed here. Studies conducted by Kaja Kaźmierska (2008), devoted to the memory of Polish-Jewish neighborhood relations are also noteworthy. In turn, discussions about the memory of the Polish-Jewish past were presented in an interesting way by Piotr Forecki in the book *Od Shoah do Strachu* (2010).

The classic assumptions of Maurice Halbwachs, based on the Durkheimian vision of the social world, remain present in the discussion of collective memory. He believes that it is in society that man acquires memories, likewise recognizing and localizing them there. Thus, remembrance is a social activity embedded in the structures of society, an activity that unites our thinking and through which we reconstruct the past (Halbwachs 1992: 39-40). This theoretical perspective seems to offer the best explanation of memory of the past for further considerations in this article. I would like to show that the analyzed social phenomena belong to two orders: individual and supra-individual. These units produce relationships, but at the same time, these relationships belong to objectivized cultural patterns belonging to society. Individuals recall the past under the pressure of the community. Individuals remember, but their remembrance is subject to socially-determined choices of particular elements from resources and from within a functioning social framework. Barbara Szacka defines collective memory as an idea of the past of one's own group, constructed by individuals from memorized information that is understood, selected and transformed according to socially-produced cultural standards. Since they are

common to the members of a given community, a unified image of the history of the group is created (Szacka 2006: 44). Moreover, what we remember from the past is determined by the present situation of the group to which we belong. Thus, when examining the memories of individuals from several dozen years ago, we must remember that their content was negotiated under conditions determined by the social contexts of the time. To simplify, we can say that the memories recorded in the 1990s are an act of reconstruction of memory about Jewish culture (including neighborhood relations), triggered and determined by what was important to the interviewees during the interview process⁴. Jan Assmann, referring to Halbwach's concept, emphasizes the moment of the creation of the image of past events by individuals through intergenerational transmission. He distinguishes between communicative memory, encompassing memories of the immediate past, and cultural memory, which appears when the first one starts to expire and is transferred to the external domain: the ritual and material (Assmann 2008: 36). Communicative memory is transmitted in a loose, informal form in everyday community life between generations, most often in the form of oral communication in family and friend circles. A particular intensification of the process of reviving or refreshing memory occurs at a time when the witnesses of past events enter the final period of their lives. The material that we have at our disposal is derived from that period, as it was a moment of the transformation of communicative memory into cultural memory. It began at the end of the 20th century, and it continued on the wave of coming to terms with the tragedies of World War II, the process of the progressive democratization of memory in Central and Eastern Europe, and of course, the naturally-occurring generational exchange, i.e., the passing away of the witnesses of the pre-war social world. Our interlocutors had a memory of the past that is unique today (Assmann 2008: 66-71). They recalled events that they remembered from their own experiences, which they took part in personally. Thus, in this case, the impact of the social frames of memory was relatively small. It did not so much allow them to free themselves from the "collective memory frame", as it allowed its modification, by recalling biographical and direct memory accessible through personal experience. Hence, we are dealing with a certain paradox that reveals itself in conversation. Individual memory based on direct memories struggles with the memory enforced by the group. The result of this aspect of the memorization process are opinions that the particular Jewish

⁴ From a methodological point of view, it is worth noting that the scientific interpretation at the time could also be different from the one proposed here.

neighbor was a good neighbor, while the “generalized” Jew was not. The interviewees assessed their relationship with a particular Jewish family as good, and in the same conversation, they spoke negatively about the relationship between Jews and non-Jews. This is a process of “producing variable images of the past, [understood – J.N.] as the emergence of a conflict field from interpersonal interactions, between differing perspectives, and as a sphere of negotiation and penetration of dissimilar ideas” (Kapralski 2010: 15-17).

In order to avoid interpreting these individual memories in the context of the memory of conflict in collective identities, let us assume that individual memory is part of many contexts of collective memory, and individuals, when sharing their memories, must take into account the complex procedure of reconciling cognitive maps in the interpretation of the past. It should also be added that memory is subject to mechanisms of forgetting. Several of its manifestations are mentioned most often, such as transience, absent-mindedness, blocking, misattribution, suggestibility, bias, and persistence (Schacter 2001). First and foremost, one must accept the fact that memory is transient and, as time goes by, we only have access to its remaining traces. However, certain episodes from the past, especially those related to direct experience, repeatedly reminded and discussed, can survive and consolidate in our memory. Therefore, in the interviews with the project’s participants, although the big picture of the past remained foggy, we came across memories of surprisingly sharp contours. Frequently, these memories were incorrectly located, in another space and time. In addition, their source was corroborated. This process was suggested by Assmann (2008: 68), who talked about “figures of memory” or “patterns of memory”. We also encountered attempts to write these memories into the contemporary situation, without disfiguring the memory’s contents. There is a number of other mechanisms which take place together with these processes, such as “the filtering of memory” (Kula 2002: 55), overlapping with “false memory” (Bieńkowska 1995: 23), or even “obliterating traces of memory” (Ricoeur 2009). In conclusion, the memories we gathered in our research are the result of many psychological, social and cultural processes. Therefore, their reading must be preceded by careful thought and the choice of appropriate interpretative frameworks.

An important aspect of the social process of reprocessing memories of the past is collective forgetting, as poignantly described by Ricoeur (2009), who points to group strategies of avoiding knowledge of a sensitive past and/or a conscious selection of events from the past,

which involve the harm of others perpetrated by ourselves. Halbwachs (1992: 182-183) has already written that society strives to remove from its memory everything which would have a negative impact on the cohesion of the community. We can also refer to Frank Ankersmit (2001), who in his analysis of the memory of the Holocaust, noted that there are events in the past that the group would like to forget, because they are painful and unpleasant to the community, and are not a cause of pride. An example of such exclusion of certain aspects of the past outside of the brackets of collective memory is the collective forgetting of Jews in postwar Poland (Ziółkowski 2001; Kula 2004; Forecki 2010). Issues related to the culture and tradition of this group were distorted, both in the context of official and popular memory. Its suffering and losses were played down. It was not mentioned that Poles were also the culprits of their tragedy, and finally, that they became the beneficiaries of acts of injustice against Jews (Ziółkowski 2001: 12-14). Since this is a separate topic, however, here I will only point out that the fact of collective forgetting of Jews, as well as of the trauma of the Holocaust undoubtedly affected the nature and content of the memories that were the subject of our study. This is particularly evident in the case of the collision of the individual memories of the study's participants with the group ideas about Jewish culture.

Neighborhood

The topic of neighborhood in sociology and social anthropology seems so obvious that it is the more surprising that so little has been written about it directly. It usually appears in the context of discussions about traditional rural communities or social change in urban communities. Sociology focuses on the character of human relations, while anthropology focuses on borders, homeliness and alienation, as well as social distance. Considerations in the field of geography of place and space also tackle the issue, as does social psychology in its discussion of interpersonal relations. For the purpose of this analysis, I assume that neighborhood is a system of more or less lasting connections and dependencies between individuals residing in a limited territory. Researchers analyzing the issue of neighborhood refer to the classical sociological concepts of the phenomenon of communality, based on the approaches of Ferdinand Tönnies, Emil Durkheim or Max Weber. These classical approaches, which take into account custom, religion, or traditions in the building of neighborhood relationships, like no other in sociology, reflect the nature of the relationship, at least in relation to traditional communities.

In this article, I pay particular attention to a paradox of the role of territory in the creation of such a social bond. In the classical understanding of the neighborhood situation, territorial proximity is a key aspect of the ties created. The proximity of the places of residence and the sharing of common space creates a special kind of intimacy and bond that create a common order. These phenomena are well observed especially in small communities, such as villages and towns. They assume a slightly different character in larger agglomerations, in which the analysis of the neighborhood relations requires the use of a different conceptual apparatus. In the described situation of the relations between Jews and non-Jews, the proximity of places did not, however, affect the nature of interpersonal relations between these groups. In spite of occupying a shared space, they remained strangers. Talking about coexistence rather than neighborhood seems to be more relevant in their description. This proximity did not generate any intimacy, because cultural otherness was a barrier. A neighbor is someone who lives near us (the distance being relative), someone who stands out from among others because of that proximity, and finally, someone with whom we enter into simple or complex social contacts. The nature of the surveyed towns and villages provided frequent direct contact between Jews and non-Jews. Villages were inhabited by several Jewish families at most, but it was difficult to notice them in this space. Even more so in towns, where Jews often constituted the majority. Of course, in the larger towns, not everyone knew each other through direct contact, but surely, there was no-one who did not have Jews in their immediate or distant neighborhood. They were recognized primarily by their foreign religion and language, but attention was also paid to dress. In the interviews, participants emphasized that they lived close by, but – as we may conclude – this did not neutralize the existing symbolic borders that kept the distance between these communities.

The neighborhood is a dynamic state of relations, which can be shallower or deeper, more durable or weaker. For the neighborhood is a potential enacted in various contexts. In the remembered Polish-Jewish neighborhood relations, it is difficult to see the existence of deepened bonds. A superficial type of neighborhood dominated, defined mainly by the proximity of space, which rarely went beyond courteous conventions, which were sometimes “enriched” by utilitarian relations. In sociological literature, attention is often drawn to the neighborhood understood as socially desirable relations based on cooperation. Here, however, we are dealing with a difficult and conflict-provoking neighborhood, burdened with aversion and a sense of threat from non-Jews. Interestingly, at the same time, in conversations about neighborhood, the

subject of conflict barely appears, and if it does, it does so in relation to the generalized group of Jews. We could hear more often that “between **us** [emphasis – J.N.] there were no conflicts”, and in the same sentence: “sometimes young people would tease **them** [emphasis – J.N.]”. Similar views were expressed by participants of Cała’s study: “Everyone was mixed together and lived in harmony, as neighbors. They did not bother other people, but there was a fashionable slogan among Poles: <<Hit the Jew>> -- Poles would attack them” (Cała 1992: 44). Such conflicts were most often associated with the Poles’/non-Jews’ conviction of being cheated and exploited by Jews, who were predominant in the economic sphere. But there were other reasons for instigating conflict, or as the interviewees termed euphemistically, “bachelor jokes”. Some were motivated by religious differences and the attitude of the priests:

Well we would fight Jews, we had it in us, just as religion taught us to hate them, I say this as a boy, we felt hatred toward Jews because the Jews crucified Christ, because they were of a different faith, and hence, we, that’s where that hatred came from, then later as adults, one was already wiser, but in their youth, boys were very (Szczawnica, M 83 Y/A).

However, most of the motifs that were mentioned in the talks were simply connected with cultural differences. This “otherness” of the Jews “provoked” people at every step. A different appearance (“we pull by the sidelocks”), kosher food (“we grease door handles with bacon”), different funeral rituals (“we ring the bells to stop the funeral procession”), festival of Sukkot (“we throw in stones”), etc.

Neighborhood is usually presented in sociological literature as a relation built in a dyadic configuration, while it is an element of much more complex social relations which often build up the local community. In the reality described, we are more interested in these networks of neighborhood relations than in the singular examples of the relations functioning there. All the more so that the personal experiences of the neighbors recalled in the memories did not translate directly into group ideas of mutual social relations. The respondents, despite their positive experiences with their neighbors, often expressed negative opinions about the nature of those relationships in relation to the community. Thus, positive social contact, even in its conventional version (c.f. Krycz 1981) had no chance of developing beyond the sphere of service. There were no statements in our studies confirming the existence of ties of solidarity nature. Thus, the neighborhood (in the sociological sense of “building ties”) did not have a chance to be “socially

consumed”. Making conclusions about relations between communities based on neighborhood dyads does not serve any purpose in this case. What was thus the result of the fact that a Polish family A lived well with a Jewish family B and that family C led social lives with family A despite their anti-Semitic attitude? In the context of one community, we could talk about the beginning of group relations, but in the Polish-Jewish context, this fact had no social consequences. If we take into account that there was hardly any social life between the two neighbors, these relations were important only in a narrow social circle. Neighborhood relations between Jews and non-Jews in the examined region did not develop a local community even in a limited form. The nature of neighborhood relations is accurately defined by Marek Ziółkowski:

A neighbor is someone in close spatial proximity, but at the same time, someone with whom one has contact. About whom one has some information, with whom one interacts in different ways. A neighbor is not one of “us”, and although s/he may be treated as the “other” in the sense of being “different” or “emotionally distant”, s/he is not entirely alien in the sense of being “unknown”. A neighboring ethnic group, its heritage and culture, the land on which it lives are in a way the subject of “our” knowledge (attitudes), which is always different from “their” self-consciousness. (Ziółkowski 1991: 59).

The distinction of the neighbor among other people is based primarily on mutual identification and initiating politically acceptable/courteous conventions that may lead to (though not necessarily) the utilization of the potential of possible relations and to the initiation of social relations. Spatial proximity and the maintenance of conventional politeness are not uncommon in the behavior of individuals, and this state can last very long – largely conditioned by cultural patterns in different types of communities. This factor of mutual recognition seems crucial to the analysis of the character of neighborhood relations. It is at this stage that we make the decision to enter into more complex social relations or to stand ready for such a relationship. What is it that makes us ready to deepen our relationship with our neighbor? The decisive factor seems to be the information that we have about our neighbor, and how we reconcile our cognitive maps in the course of interaction. The primary source of our knowledge is the personal experience and data that we gain from other people. This confirms our belief, whether it is worthwhile to enter into a deep relation, or whether we should beware of them. Another issue is whether the potential interaction partner is also interested in sustaining and developing the contact. In the case of mutual Polish-Jewish neighborhood relations, knowledge about our neighbors seems to be

a central factor in the creation of the neighborhood's character. First, the knowledge that the Poles/non-Jews had about their neighbors was of a particular dimension. In a large part, they had a simplistic picture based on stereotypes about the Jewish group (despite its proximity). Secondly, the strongly negative stereotype of the neighbors made it difficult for the knowledge gained in direct relations to "break through" to peoples' consciousness and to modify this stereotype. Finally, the cultural distance between the groups generated the existence of expressive symbolic boundaries that hindered mutual understanding. Non-Jewish neighbors in small towns and villages lacked the deep curiosity of "the other". They told stories of the "golden calf", and few of them ever visited a synagogue. They talked about the burial of the dead in sitting position, while few went to the funeral of their Jewish neighbor, or ate azyme, to which they said Jews added the blood of Christian children, etc.

Who do you want for a neighbor?

Let us go back to the results of the research from the 1990s and look at how the inhabitants of the region remembered their neighbors. I will analyze statements given in response to the questions about the choice of a neighbor, the assessment of these relations and the features distinguishing Jews. In the survey, respondents were asked the following question: "If you could choose, who would be the best neighbor (a Jew, German, Ukrainian, Russian, Czech or a person of a different nationality)?". In response, many different arguments for or against the choice of a particular nationality were given. The first group consists of answers that emphasize the importance of the person, and not their nationality. The position is best reflected by the following quotations from the interviews: "Nationality is not important to me, as long as the person is good", or "You cannot choose your neighbor, to choose them, you first have to get to know them. It depends on the character and your way of life" (Dynów, M 67 Y/A).

Another group of answers consists of statements which also contain a brief description of the chosen nationality. It is best illustrated by the following quote:

Czechs are false. Germans are Germans. There is an old proverb, an old one, that whatever the world may be, a German will never be a Pole's brother. And as far back as history goes, Germans have always attacked Poland. They always considered it a conquered nation. As far as Jews are concerned, Jews have been forced out into the

whole world. They are not to blame. Well, it would be hard to choose. Similarly with Poles. They are also false and they are also... They can be a good or bad neighbor (Andrychów, M 76 Y/A).

Taking into account Polish-Jewish relations, one has to admit that there were surprisingly many answers (despite existing stereotypes) which pointed to Jews as candidates for good neighbors. Let us take a closer look at what arguments in the respondents' answers spoke for or against the choice of Jews.

Arguments for choosing a Jew for a neighbor	Arguments against choosing a Jew for a neighbor
I don't know... Maybe even a Jew. Maybe they would offer help sooner than others. Because people would sometimes seek help with Jews. When they were poor, they would borrow money from a Jew. People usually had little money, and a Jew always had it (Lesko, F 64 Y/A).	Definitely not a Jew. They are not very progressive, I am talking about the prewar Jews, because currently, Jews are a global intellectual power. I would choose a German – considering their resourcefulness, mind and progressiveness (Nowy Żmigród, M 77 Y/A)
A Jew. Because I had one. Sure. Very much so. Miss, there were never any arguments, no rumors, no rows, no envy. And you could, Miss, they would even rather come to us, because we didn't always fare well; other times they would come and ask for help with something. They acknowledged it, you know. It was a good life like that. (Lubaczów, F 76 Y/A).	Well, with a Jew I would not make peace very soon, nor with a Ukrainian. I would sooner reconcile with a German, with the official enemy, according to the proverb: "Save me Lord from my friends, for with my enemies I can deal with myself". After the war, the whole government, the security were Jews. They abused Poles in a savage way. For example Różański, Berman, here in Bielsko also Lampe and many others (Bielsko-Biała, M 74 Y/A).
They say there's a proverb "There is no better neighbor than a Jew" and it really is so. My Aunt in Dębica lived in a kind of <i>hosel</i> , the Jew was ideal, a very good neighbor, selfless. I won't say anything in particular about Jews. Nothing bad. (Ropczyce, F 73 Y/A).	I would choose one who lives according to Christian rules. That is, not a Jew, nor a German. (Ciężkowice, M 72 Y/A)
It seems to me that living with Jews was the calmest. He would not be interested what's up with me, I would not be interested in what he is up to. And other nationalities, be it Ukrainians, or Poles or Russians are interested: how you live, what you live from, where you have it from, and this envy. And there would be no envy with them [Jews – Z.B.] (Ustrzyki Dolne, no data).	Because they were these enclosed enclaves for Christians (Bielsko-Biała, M 74 Y/A).

From the proposed list of potential neighbors the interviewees often pointed to Jews, emphasizing their non-confrontational character and courtesy. Therefore, the social distance

which persisted between the groups, created a sense of safe distance, and a Jew who did not interfere too much in the life of a Pole/non-Jew gave a sense peace. I had the impression that the Jews recalled in the memories did not constitute a threat to neighborhood relations in the common perception, of which, for example, Ukrainians were accused. It also seems that they were perceived as relatively submissive, which allowed them to be treated not only as a non-competitive or harmless group, but also one in relation to which you could place yourself higher in the social hierarchy – they were weaker, so they were not perceived as a threat. The second argument in favor of Jews is associated with the economic factor; you could borrow money from them or buy goods on credit. Such a neighbor is always valued. On the other hand, this did not stop people from using the same reasons in reference to the whole group to discredit Jews as bloodsuckers and exploiters getting rich at the expense of non-Jews. Arguments against the choice of Jews for a neighbor also appeared. The perspectives most obvious to the interlocutors are contained in the maxim “a Jew is a Jew”, and everything is supposedly clear. But more specific reservations against Jewish neighbors were also made. They did not live according to Christian principles, or they celebrated on “the wrong days”. What for some was a reason to choose Jews as their neighbors, and was associated with their flair for trade, for others turned out to be an argument against them, because “the Jew always outwitted Poles”. What also appeared, albeit rarely, was the idea about Jews’ relationship with the security services and communist authorities. Generally, however, Jews were chosen as potential neighbors more often than representatives of others nations. What is characteristic of these memories is that the arguments for choosing Jews as neighbors more often had the form of direct references to specific people, while the arguments against Jews as neighbors were uttered in a generalized form and referred to the whole group of Jews. This mechanism of describing Polish-Jewish relations was also visible in other fragments of the interviews. A concrete Jew could have been “good”, and here the arguments and memories testifying to correct relationships were recalled, but in the generalized descriptions of the group, unflattering and stigmatizing terms were used to describe the Jews as a group. So we have memories in which two mutually exclusive narratives interweave in one conversation. For example, compassion because of the suffering and tragedy of individual families during the war and a general accusation that they themselves are to blame for it.

In answering a different question: “Is it good that Jews lived in your town?”, the vast majority of interviewees answered that it was neither good nor bad: “I cannot tell you whether it

was good or bad. Everyone had to work for themselves. I did not have anything against them, I lived well with all people, because that's how you should live" (Szczepieszyn, F 86 Y/A). However, almost everyone referred to the fact that Jews were an important link in everyday relationships as they were involved in trade:

You know... well, it's hard to say it was okay, it was just that you could get anything from a Jew. You had a zloty, you went and gave it to him, bought something, and bought it without money too, then you had to give back three, but you bought it, and you could not get it from a Catholic, a Catholic did not sell without money... (Szczucin, M 70 Y/A).

You cannot say it was either bad or good. They accumulated all capital. They would say: "Your streets, our tenement houses". Trade was in their hands, they were like leeches (Rymanów, F 66 Y/A).

According to Cała, as is clear from the interviews she conducted, Polish-Jewish contacts were confined mainly to the economic sphere. In it, the pattern of Jewish salesman – Catholic client prevailed. It was the basis of the stereotypical building of the image of the Jew as a usurer that cheated Poles/non-Jews (Cała 1992). Another issue was the comparison of characteristic occupational activities of Jews with hard work, mainly in the field, which Jews did not grow in principle. Trade, as the most frequently mentioned occupation of Jews, was not highly valued, being even synonymous with laziness and lack of integrity: "They took business that was beneficial into their own hands. And one from which there were no benefits, he couldn't stand. They said that he preferred a kilo of trade to a meter of work". (Borchów, M 80 Y/A).

There were also voices that the presence of Jews and their talent for trade facilitated everyday life, because Poles/non-Jews could not run stores so well and avoided doing many useful activities:

For Grybów, it had a large and positive impact, because Poles did not like some branches of trade, e.g., bone purchase, hoof purchase, intestines. And they did it without complaining. They did not feel humiliated by the fact that they traded some less valuable commodities, rather they did any work that allowed them to provide for their families and children (Grybów, M 64 Y/A).

There was also the fear that they were occupying a dominant social position and might eliminate Poles from it: “Both good and bad. On the one hand, he lent money when there was no money. On the other hand, Poland is for Poles, not for Jews or others. And they were doing too well here” (Ciężkowice, M 72 Y/A).

So how could we answer the key question asked here: Were they living together or separately?

No. The gentile was unclean, relations with gentiles probably did not exist. Only rich Jews, without racial prejudice, they voluntarily isolated themselves from society, they did not want close contacts with society. They lived in their environment. They kept to their ghettos (Sanok, M 73 Y/A).

The homes of these Jews had no contact with the Poles, they lived in their closed circles (Rymanów, M, no data).

As for the rest of the Jewish population, they were quite closed, they had their own cultural, political and sports organizations, while the intelligentsia, which spoke Polish, their influence on political and social life was quite significant (Kęty, M 69 Y/A).

Alina Cała commented:

The model created by the province's residents allowed conflict-free coexistence, but without major contacts. Mutual tolerance, according to them, allowed for life next to each other. It was a pattern originating from a statist society, divided into closed communities, fortified with impassable (at least in theory) borders (Cała 1992: 16)⁵.

I would suggest, however, in reference to actual relations, a different interpretation of this life “side by side” of Poles/non-Jews and Jews, which results indirectly from noted down memories, but also from our knowledge of that period. It seems to me that the main reason for the inability to create a neighborly bond, understood as a certain type of intimate relationship resulting from

⁵ What is interesting, but also understandable is that in the 1990s, very rarely did the interviewed respondents refer to the state arrangement that characterized pre-war society and whose image was still in the minds of the interlocutors in the 1980s. In newer studies, questions about a hierarchical social system and the place of Jews in it were met with a lack of understanding. Questions about the “peasant, gentleman and Jew” were barely legible. The fifty years after the war not only changed the social structure, but also the language of the describing the hierarchy in the local community. The interlocutors described old social relations (from the past) with new concepts.

closeness, was not a “state difference” resulting from the positions occupied in the social structure, but a cultural alienness that I have already mentioned. They did not visit each other in homes and memories of common celebration or work were rare. Despite the many occasions created by spatial proximity, they did not reduce the cultural distance and were stuck in their communities separated by symbolic boundaries for years.

What distinguished Jews in the eyes of Polish neighbors?

In the answers to the question: “What good and/or bad qualities do Jews have?”, many positive qualities were mentioned. Above all, the Jews’ group solidarity was highly appreciated. Examples of it were given as the community’s asset, but it was sometimes also seen as a trait testifying to the insularity of, and the lack of admission of Poles/non-Jews to the group.

Yes, the good qualities of Jews were their internal solidarity, very visible at every step. If somewhere in a street incident, the clash of young boys with young Jews, there was a clash, then Jews were, you could see, united, one of them would... that Jew who would be there, right, whether they were beating, or were being harassed, right away they would defend him. It was this solidarity to help, to help each other economically, right. It was this one feature, that made them distinct in a very united and clear way. But besides that, it was normal, like every person, actually, you cannot – there were bad and good ones, true, but they were rather kind were rather, yes, it was visible... They were easy to cohabit with, they were compatible in living with neighbors or in the community at large. And active – another positive thing about them, they were very active in economic life, very active, hardworking, economical, hardworking, satisfied with the small, distinct, they were distinct in this respect from the Poles who immediately wanted, right, a big property, and they worked small things and settled for the small, and then they came to large money... And in co-existence with the inhabitants, Catholics, Christians, they were good (Pilzno, M 75 Y/A).

Jews were united. There were some exceptions, they would fight here and there over some business, but in general they respected each other, stuck together, and ours did not, ours did not. They respect each other together. There were also quarrels between them, but in

general they watched themselves and respected each other (Dąbrowa Tarnowska, M 66 Y/A).

Jews, they're this clan that stuck together. A Jew always supported a Jew. It was with them, that's how it was – they could argue, they could be enemies, but if he was in trouble, the kehilla immediately rescued him. The Jews quickly saved him. Jews, this is a single nation, which has unity holds (Brzozów, F 84 Y/A).

A quotation showing the situation of a person mediating with a group of Poles is telling of the perception of these unifying forces:

There was a Jew, a horse trader, Suchar was his name. He played a know-all, philosophized, mocked religion, he often stayed with the Poles, he was completely cut off [from the Jews⁶], he found himself outside of the Jewish community, so that when he was in trouble, the Jews did not rush at all with help (Dynów, M 67 Y/A).

By referring to my own memories from the time of conducting this research, I recalled many remarks about people crossing the symbolic borders of the communities. Both Jews and non-Jews looked at members of their own groups who had wider/deeper relationships with members of the other group suspiciously. I do not only mean those few extreme judgments concerning, for example, marriages with “strangers”, but also knowledge of Yiddish and frequent contacts with Jews or well-developed businesses exposed non-Jews to comments about switching to the “other side”. Also, in the Jewish environment, those who maintained intimate relations with Gentiles were looked upon reluctantly (at least that is how it is remembered by Poles/non-Jews). Community “guards” noticed acts of crossing the symbolic boundaries and moved such persons to the margins of the group. This proves that communality and its rules determined patterns of neighborhood relations. Close neighbors sometimes participated in the worlds of two communities, and this resulted in sanctions for the transgression of borders. Hence, in my opinion, the pattern of neighborhood relations prevailing in the memories of the respondents is what it is. Neither of the communities accepted increased familiarization with their neighbors.

Many of the answers indicated that Jews were good people. Significantly more positive than negative attributes were mentioned. People noticed their readiness to help others, mainly

⁶ The statements in square brackets in the quotations are by the author.

Jews, but many of the interlocutors admitted that they could also count on their help. Their conflict-free character was mentioned, although sometimes they were accused of not being able to fight for their themselves. Their kindness was appreciated. In mentioning their other positive features, it was emphasized that Jews were not drunkards. It must have been a serious social problem, since it was pointed out very often that Jews could refrain from drinking:

Jews were not drunkards, every Jew had vodka at home. But only a glass after the Sabbath. The Jew was not seen to be lying about drunk in the street (Dynów, F 69 Y/A).

They were not alcoholics, that's how much they respected the penny (...). Jews drank vodka on Saturday from a thimble. One, two, and that was all, and you did not see it, firstly because it spoiled their opinion, and secondly because vodka was a waste of money, you had to convert it into money (Dębica, F 80 Y/A).

Among the negative features mentioned was the ability of Jews to cheat for profit. However, it should be remembered that such comments usually appeared in the context of lending money or giving loans to Poles/non-Jews. The statement: "They always claimed theirs" sounds like an accusation, but we can guess that they just tried to get back the borrowed money, as one would in a trade relation. I leave the following quotation without comment: "Bad qualities – on the way to their death bed, they behaved maliciously. They tore up dollars and when he had the opportunity to give them to someone, he wouldn't" (Nowy Żmigród, M 76 Y/A).

It was noticed that some people were sloppy and dirty, but it was usually emphasized that this most often pertained to the poorest, those living in poverty. In answering questions about Jewish houses, the overwhelming majority remembered them as small, cramped, and dirty. Many remember the unpleasant odors that dominated these households. Obviously, the homes of wealthy Jews were judged much better. Surely, taking into account the factor of class would draw a different image of these relations. The respondents were aware of the social differentiation of the status of both the non-Jews and the Jews. Still another analytic filter would be to show the differences between Jews. Poles/non-Jews did not like the "*fusyci*", "*chusyci*" or those "orthodox" Jews (as Hasidic Jews were called). They preferred "progressive" Jews, because such status significantly reduced the barriers between neighbors.

Types of neighborhoods

I use the typology proposed by Piotr Kryczka, modifying it slightly to order the memories of these neighborhood relations. Although it refers to a different social reality, the mechanism of building and maintaining a neighborhood relationship remains similar. Kryczka (1981) distinguishes six types of neighborhood: limiting, informed, conventional, service-based, solidarity-based and friendly-social. I combined the limiting and informed neighborhood types, assuming that in traditional communities from more than half a century ago, the awareness of the presence of a neighbor itself meant having basic information about them. The author of this concept draws attention primarily to the functional aspect of coexistence, but in a culturally homogeneous community. Trying to apply this pattern of relations to the categorization of Polish-Jewish relations, we must remember what I have repeatedly emphasized – that we have here a recollection of a neighborhood divided by cultural boundaries.

1. Restrictive neighborhood – this is a type of relationship in which the neighbors have an awareness of its existence, which determines behavior that does not cause its negative evaluation by the other party. It can be said that this is the minimum condition that confirms the bond resulting from the operating norm without detriment to the partner in the relationship. Informed neighborhood concerns relations in which we are not only aware of the neighbor's closeness, but also have basic information about the other side: i.e., who they are, what they do, etc. So who was the Jewish neighbor for Poles? “A quite normal person, just like us. Except that they had a different religion” (Sanok, F 70 Y/A). First of all, they differed in their denomination, their tongue and all the rules – such opinions were usually heard.

Who is this Jew? A completely normal person who professes a different religion and (...) the religion puts upon him special rigors. What I said and the Sabbath celebrations, celebrating the Passover, celebrating sukkahs and other Jewish holidays. And besides that, Miss, they did not like hard work. They mainly dealt with trade and small crafts. Such as, tailoring, shoemaking, they liked some orchestras a lot, and teaching some dance classes. Such activities rather. Besides, what can you say about Jews; they were varied themselves. Some were handsome and stupid, others ugly and wise (Brzozów, M 78 Y/A).

Jews spoke only Jewish at home, Yiddish. They communicated in this language between each other, in commercial and craft contacts, because they were always a tight

circle. They were a closed, alien and separate community. Closed in their religious, customary and linguistic circle (Dynów, M 67 Y/A).

There is no doubt that Polish neighbors were aware of the “otherness” of the Jews and the limitations resulting from these cultural differences, primarily linguistic and religious ones. In their memories, the respondents most often emphasized that these differences allowed them to live side by side without conflict. At the same time, it is visible that the awareness of the differences indicated cohabitation, rather than building neighborly relations. Although the dimension of direct neighborhood relations looks quite idyllic in the memories, during the conversations, information would often appear that suggested this coexistence was disturbed by an “excesses” of young people, or that under the influence of community solidarity, it would turn into dislike and hostility at group level. The same “harmless” Jewish neighbor became an “other” and an enemy of Poles/non-Jews at the community level. Therefore, referring to this type of neighborhood, it can be stated that, while the cultural diversity of Jews was noticed and did not cause tensions in direct relations (we can speak of an indifferent neighborhood), it was significant at the group level. Still in another way, to paraphrase the respondents’ answers, one could say: “my neighbor was okay, but they [Jews – Z.B.] as neighbors were not”.

2. Conventional neighborhood – this is the type of relationship in which we not only know something about each other, but we also enter into the basic behaviors and interactions related to, for example, the exchange of greetings and short conversations. The following statements illustrate the existence of such a type of neighborhood:

Jews kept separate, but we played in the yard with young Jews (Grybów, M 66 Y/A).

Sometimes they exchanged a sentence or two, how’s your health, and that was that, but they did not maintain those closer social contacts at all (Dynów, M 67 Y/A).

Yes, something like that, they came there, but they were very polite. They would address people very politely. With some request, yes. But as friends – no. They did not connect with us Catholics. Because with Ukrainians there was no difference... (Borchów, M 80 Y/A).

No. I have never been to their home. Probably not. We did meet in yards, we met at school, but we did not go to each other's homes like that (Zarszyn, K 70 Y/A).

It was the most common type of contact present in mutual relations. Our interlocutors gave examples of such conventional behaviors eagerly, pointing out that the religious barrier was not conducive to crossing a certain boundary. That boundary was the home/private space.

3. Service-based neighborhood – we go beyond brief greetings and conversations, and we combine them with activities related to the provision of small services.

In the memories of the respondents Jews constituted a separate community, they were closed in their cultural, linguistic, and religious circles, etc. What, then, did they have in common with Poles/non-Jews? It can be said that nothing connected them except for purely material and financial contacts. A Jew ran a shop or a workshop, he needed goys as clients, and sometimes he himself would use their services.

They would come to us, we had a cow at our place, they took milk from us and we met with Jews almost every day. (...) They came to us, we went to them, but to host guests... or hold a special party, they would never come to such a party. Never (Bobowa, F 66 Y/A)

They came to us... mostly Jewish women, because mommy sewed. So they would come and bring different things for sewing. And father was a shoemaker, so they brought shoes (Ciężkowice, M 77 Y/A)

Before the war such relations that the Jews would come to us, and in turn we would go to the Jews – no, there were no such phenomena, they were not here at all. However, due to the fact that my father worked in “kerosene” under these conditions, I must say that it was a privilege and when my father, being in the city and wanting to buy shoes or clothes or something for his child, in the small province, the village, the town people knew each other well, so that during the purchase they invited him over to their flat to drink a tea, but apart from this relation there were no other friendly relations (Iwonicz, M 68 Y/A).

We visited each other. It was on an official occasion, to learn about the condition of the house, to take some ordinance (Krosno, M 82 Y/A).

Sure, yes, they lived in harmony and helped each other out. It is how the Jews who lived in the countryside would often appear, and again these peasant farmers helped the Jews there because they did not have a horse. So he would plough their field, and he gave him money for it, he paid him for it, and besides that, I don't know what a Jew could have helped me (Lubaczów, F 77 Y/A).

4. A friendly-social neighborhood is a type of bond that generates friendly relations that encourage us to participate in family life; visits, celebration of important occasions together, etc. Here are the examples from the interviews:

Yes, not socially, that didn't happen. They did their own thing and we did ours (Fryszak, F 74 Y/A). Invitations to parties, celebrations were not practiced. They did not practice invitations with Poles. They were more to themselves, though they were kind (Krosno, F 65 Y/A).

The relations with this butcher were very friendly, [but to visit] not to such an extent, to hang out, but only business connected us (UstrzykiDolne, M 79 Y/A).

Friends, it is hard to say that we were friends, but in any case, we were in good contact (Ustrzyki Dolne, no data).

No. The Jews did not sit in the bar because the food was non-kosher. They did not go there. Those bars, beer, all of that, that was just for us (Bobowa, M 70 Y/A).

Although there are quotes that confirm the existence of a friendly relationship for this type of neighborhood, it is worth noting once again that they relate mainly to memories from the school period of the interlocutors:

I went to my friend's there opposite me. They had an iron shop, but she would stay at my place more than I would stay at hers. Such friendly [relations – Z.B.] (Ustrzyki Dolne, F 79 Y/A). We visited each other with those friends with whom I went to school. Sometimes I needed something from him, sometimes he needed something to me, so we visited each other. And with those who lived here in the closest neighborhood. Getz lived here in the closest neighborhood, he came to us, we went to them, we would come to them. Without any special occasion (Grybów, M 64 Y/A).

When it comes to social contacts, I would go to my Jewish friends and they would come to me. We had fun together, we learned together, we played ball together. Somewhere on a walk, or in the city during some shopping, so there was constant contact (Brzozów, M 70 Y/A).

5. Solidarity-based neighborhood – in this type of relationship there is already awareness of mutual interests resulting from spatial proximity. We are ready to take action for the benefit of community to which we belong.

And here we come to the quintessence of memorized neighborhood relations between the affected groups. There was no neighborhood at the community level. Poles/non-Jews did not develop close neighborhood ties with Jews. There were such, though limited, relations with Icek or Szubert, but not with Jews. In the records of four-hundred interviews conducted in the 1990s in south-eastern Poland, I did not find one statement that would illustrate the solidarity-based type of neighborhood. Maybe such examples existed, but our interlocutors could not spontaneously mention them in a conversation about Polish-Jewish relations.

Conclusion

Summing up, I will try to determine the characteristic types of neighborhood of Jews with non-Jews, as remembered by the interlocutors. Undoubtedly, it is possible to distinguish the informed type of neighborhood. Due to the characteristics of Jewish culture, it was impossible not to notice that the neighbors were Jews. Because we are analyzing the life of communities in small towns and cities and sometimes villages, it should be remembered that the spatial proximity did not leave room for anonymity. Every resident of these towns knew who their neighbor was, they knew their nationality and had at least basic information about their family. All our interlocutors declared such a level of knowledge about their Jewish neighbors. The conventional type of neighborhood was also quite common. Poles not only knew who their neighbors were, but they also entered into basic interactions with them. What is characteristic, these interactions – as it seems on the basis of the memories – resulted from either school or professional contacts. They were limited mainly to the public sphere, and in the case of children or teenagers, common places of spending free time, such as the backyard or street. Although not all respondents spoke about such type of mutual relations, it can be assumed that it was relatively widespread. Much rarer was

the service-based type of neighborhood. Although we have accumulated many declarations confirming the emergence of relations with Jews beyond the sphere of conventional and often occasional exchange of courtesy, much fewer people admitted that mutual favors were also performed. Such contacts were usually associated with simple economic exchange – for example, people would pick up milk or tailoring and shoemaking services were used. Even if such interactions underpinned by the provision of services existed, they were rarely associated with mutual visits at home. If anything, the visits were of a working character, and not a neighborly, selfless visit. The friendly-social neighborhood was equally rare. Probably in various social groups it looked differently, but the average Polish family did not enter into intimate relationships with Jews. Even if declarations of friendship relations appeared, they were often accompanied by reservations that they did not have a more intimate character. Mutual visits, especially family ones, were extremely rare. I did not find any description of them in any of the interviews – although, as I recall from the conversations, one may think that such a situation did take place. Probably more frequent visits were possible in the homes of better-off or intelligentsia families.

On the basis of the recalled memories, we can say that a traditionally-understood neighborhood, going beyond the conventional courteous behaviors, did not have a chance to be formed between these communities, because of the big cultural differences. Actually, there was no sphere of life that would help to create closeness and initiate an intimate relationship, supported by trust and reciprocity. Tolerance (with restrictions) was the maximum, which could have developed in such conditions.

It should be remembered that I referred to materials that are not a record of the past, but rather its image. The interlocutors, “remembering” their relationships with Jews from their childhood and youth, modified their memories according to the cultural standards in force in the group. Their content was negotiated in conditions determined by various social contexts, and the analyzed material is a derivative of these processes and the circumstances of our conversations conducted in the transformation period of the 1990s. An additional variable, which should be included in the analysis, is the fact that the interpretation is made several decades later, in a new cultural reality, and in a new social framework of memory.

What I think was crucial, was the community’s influence on the individual memories of the Polish-Jewish neighborhood ties. I argue that in the assessment of the relations between Jews

and non-Jews, group pressure played a fundamental role, through the designated frameworks of memory. The respondents rated their relations with the Jewish family neighbor well, and in the same conversation, they gave negative judgments about “generalized” relations with Jews. I tried to indicate the conflict fields of memory between individual memories and the group interest in preserving identity cohesion. According to my argument, the recalled memories are products of changing images of the past created in the course of negotiations and interpenetrations of various images of the past functioning in the community.

REFERENCES

- Ankersmit F.R.
2001 *The Sublime Dissociation of the Past: Or How to Be(come) What One Is No Longer*, “History and Theory: Studies in the Philosophy of History” 40:3, pp. 295-422.
- Assmann J.
2008 *Pamięć kulturowa. Pismo, zapamiętywanie i polityczna tożsamość w cywilizacjach starożytnych*, trans. A. Kryczyńska-Pham, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
2011 *Memory of Culture and Early Civilization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bieńkowska E.
1995 *Mała historia pamięci (Pamięć jednostkowa, pamięć zbiorowa)*, „Znak” 47: 5, pp. 19-30.
- Cała A.
1992 *Wizerunek Żyda w polskiej kulturze ludowej*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Connerton P.
1989 *How Societies Remember*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Forecki P.
2010 *Od Shoah do Strachu. Spory o polsko-żydowską przeszłość i pamięć w debatach publicznych*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.
- Halbwachs M.
1992 *Social Frameworks of Memory*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kaniowska K.
2003 *Antropologia i problem pamięci*, „Konteksty. Polska Sztuka Ludowa” 262-263: 3-4, pp. 57-65.
- Kapralski S.
2010 *Pamięć, przestrzeń, tożsamość. Próba refleksji teoretycznej*, w: S. Kapralski (ed.), *Pamięć, przestrzeń, tożsamość*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, pp. 15-17.
2015 *O co chodzi w wywiadzie? Proba interpretacji wspomnień o Żydach jako narracji tożsamościowych*, „Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej” 11: 4, pp. 6-33.
- Kaźmierska K.
2008 *Biografia i pamięć*, Kraków: Nomos.
- Kryczka P.

- 1981 *Spoleczność osiedla mieszkaniowego w wielkim mieście: ideologie i rzeczywistość*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Kula M.
2002 *Nośniki pamięci historycznej*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG.
- 2004 *Między przeszłością a przyszłością. O pamięci, zapominaniu i przewidywaniu*, Poznań: Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk.
- Le Goff J.
1992 *History and Memory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lowenthal D.
1985 *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nora P. (ed.)
1996-98 *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*, vol. 1-3, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Orla-Bukowska A.M.
2006 *New Threads on an Old Loom. National Memory and Social Identity in Postwar and Post-Communist Poland*, in: R.N. Lebow, W. Kansteiner (eds.), *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*, Durham, London: Duke University Press, pp. 177-209.
- Ricoeur P.
2009 *Memory, History, Forgetting*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schacter D.
2003 *Siedem grzechów pamięci*, trans. E. Haman, J. Rączaszek, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Szacka B.
2006 *Czas przeszły, pamięć, mit*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Tokarska-Bakir
2004 *Rzeczy mgliste*, Sejny: Pogranicze.
- Ziółkowski M.
1991 *Wspólnota korzeni i odmiennosc tradycji*, „Kultura i Społeczeństwo” 35: 4, pp. 59-71.
- 2001 *Pamięć i zapominanie: trupy w szafie polskiej zbiorowej pamięci*, „Kultura i Społeczeństwo” 45: 3-4, pp. 3-22.

Magdalena Zatorska
Institute of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology
University of Warsaw

LOCAL INTERPRETATIONS OF HASIDIC PILGRIMAGES TO POLAND AND UKRAINE (LELOV, LIZHENSK, UMAN)

If wandering, considered as a state of detachment from every given point in space, is the conceptual opposite of attachment to any point, then the sociological form of “the stranger” presents the synthesis, as it were, of both these properties. (This is another indication that spatial relations not only are determining conditions of relationships among men, but are also symbolic of those relationships.) The stranger will thus not be considered here in the usual sense of the term, as the wanderer who comes today and goes tomorrow, but rather as the man who comes today and stays tomorrow—the potential wanderer, so to speak, who, although he has gone no further, has not quite got over the freedom of coming and coming.

(Simmel 1971: 143)

Introductory remarks

This text¹ is a summary of the first stage of research on the influence of Hasidic pilgrimages on the local communities of Lelów, Leżajsk and Uman. The goal of the doctoral thesis prepared on the basis of these studies is to show the nuanced attitudes of various groups of residents towards the Hasidim and the multilayered debates that take place openly, or in a way, underneath the surface in the studied communities. Due to the fact that the research is in progress, and the development and analysis of the ethnographic material collected to date has not been completed yet, in the article, I do not consider the entire spectrum of attitudes of the inhabitants of Lelów,

¹ The article was written under the National Science Center grant „Relacje polsko-żydowskie i ukraińsko-żydowskie w kontekście współczesnych pielgrzymek chasydzkich do Polski i na Ukrainę. Studium porównawcze” [Eng. Polish-Jewish and Ukrainian-Jewish relations in the context of contemporary Hasidic pilgrimages to Poland and Ukraine. An empirical study] (project no. 013/11/N/HS3/04965). Thanks to financing from this grant, I am conducting the research in Uman and Leżajsk.

Leżajsk and Uman towards the Hasidim. I also omit issues important for the topic, such as, the knowledge and memory of the Holocaust of the Jewish inhabitants of the studied towns, memory of Polish and Ukrainian violence towards Jews during wartime and the post-war period, or modern anti-Semitism. This decision is also informed by a number of ethical problems resulting from the fact that the interests of the entities directly or indirectly involved in the research, the conditions of the production of anthropological knowledge and the political nature of anthropological representations (see Baer n.d.) are hard to reconcile, and I am unable to deal with them at this stage of the research.

In the article I outline the context of the Hasidic pilgrimages to Lełów, Leżajsk and Uman, and I present three selected forms of local “responses” to their development. These are: the municipal “Ciulim-Czulent Holiday” organized in Lełów, the activity of a blogger from Leżajsk popularizing knowledge about the pilgrimages and the Jewish community living in the city before the war, and protests against Hasidim Jews initiated by the Council of Civic Organizations in Uman.

Taking into account the first ideas and pilot research trips, I have been conducting the research, whose results form the basis of the article, since 2011. Fieldwork trips take place both during Hasidic holidays, during which the studied places are visited by groups of pilgrims and the everyday life of some of the inhabitants is subordinated to these events, as well as outside of them. In addition, in Lełów, observing two editions of the “Ciulim-Czulent Festival”, materials were collected on the methods of constructing Jewishness and Polishness during this event. From 2011 to 2016, the total time of fieldwork in Lełów amounted to six weeks, in Leżajsk – to four weeks, and in Uman, eight weeks.

Most of the interviewees are residents of the studied locations, including ones who contact the pilgrims directly – among others, people renting their rooms or houses to them, vendors, taxi drivers, law enforcement and translators. Individuals actively shaping the local memory policy and affecting the shape of relations between the residents and the Hasidim constitute a particularly important category. Thus, among the interlocutors are representatives of local authorities and local activists, both those who are responsible for the commemoration of Jewish history and keeping it alive, as well as the organizers of protests against the Hasidim. The study also include visitors who come to the celebrations to observe and document them, including

photographers and other people declaring interest in Jewish culture. The pilgrims themselves are also my interlocutors.

The source materials include records of ethnographic interviews carried out in Lelów, Leżajsk and Uman, fieldwork notes, press reports, internet blogs, promotional materials of the studied municipalities and events organized by them. In Uman, the number of interviews was 30, in Leżajsk – 17, and in Lelów – 190 (in which town we worked in a multi-person team²). In addition, 14 interviews with Hasidim were conducted.

I communicated with the residents of Uman and the surrounding area in Ukrainian, Russian or Surzhyk (a mixed language, containing elements of the Ukrainian and Russian languages, popular in the cities of central Ukraine). I spoke with the residents of Leżajsk, Lelów and the surrounding areas in Polish, while the conversations with the Hasidim and the photographers and filmmakers from Western European countries visiting the researched towns during Hasidic holidays were conducted in English.

The meaning of the pilgrimage in Hasidism

The pilgrimage in Hasidism is connected with the person of the tsaddik, a charismatic spiritual leader. The tsaddik – the main “innovation” which Hasidism introduced to Judaism on the grounds of religious authority, constitutes the center of the community, both in a religious and social dimension (Rapoport-Albert 1991). As Gershom Scholem explains, “the later development of Zaddikism [the cult of tzadiks – M.Z.] was already implicit in the very start of the Hasidic movement” (Scholem 1995 [1946]: 342). The road that Hasidism went through from a mystical movement to a social phenomenon,

The whole development centers round the personality of the Hasidic saint; this is something entirely new. Personality takes the place of doctrine (...). The new ideal of the religious leader, the Zaddik,

² The research in Lelów was conducted in the years 2014-2016 under the “Ethnographic laboratory”, which I completed in the Institute of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology at Warsaw University, and under the project „Oddolne tworzenie kultury. Wielostanowiskowe studium porównawcze”, co-financed by the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage. The people who took part in the study were: Anna Auguścik, Agnieszka Białowska, Aleksandra Borek, Urszula Borkowska, Tomasz Chwałek, Aleksandra Domaradzka, Michał Gałek, Przemysław Gliński, Karolina Gmyz, Anna Greszta, Agnieszka Gwiazdowicz, Marcin Kokotkiewicz, Weronika Kwiatkowska, Antonina Stasiuk i Jacek Wajszczak.

differs from the traditional ideal of rabbinical Judaism, the Talmid Hakham or student of the Torah, mainly in that he himself “has become Torah”. It is no longer his knowledge but his life which leads a religious value to his personality. He is the living incarnation of the Torah. Inevitably the original mystical conception of the bottomless depths within the Torah was soon transferred to the personality of the saint, and in consequence it quickly appeared that the various groups of Hasidim were developing different characteristics in accordance with the particular type of saint to whom they looked for guidance. To establish a common type becomes not a little difficult. In the development of Hasidism opposing extremes found their place (...). (Scholem 1995 [1946]: 344)³.

Anna Ciałowicz writes about the importance of the pilgrimage to the tsaddik in a realistic way using the recollections of Icchak Ewen (1861-1925), writer and journalist raised in the Hasidic tradition. The author explains:

Traveling to the tsaddik is an important duty, because on the way a man gets rid of arrogance and self-righteousness. (...) Especially in Russia, the tsaddiks were very mobile and showed great enthusiasm in spreading the Hasidic idea (...). It was different in central Poland and Galicia: here the Hasidim traveled en masse to the tsaddiks, who rarely went on the road, unless they wanted to visit each other. This difference was even in the language; while in Russia the question was: “Whose Hasidim are you?”, in central Poland and in Galicia, it was asked: “To which tsaddik do you travel?” (Ciałowicz 2006: 185).

Contemporary Hasidic pilgrimages to Poland and Ukraine

According to the above remarks, pilgrimage is an important element of religious identity in Hasidism. The practice of pilgrimage to the tsaddik or to his grave was present in many Hasidic circles in Eastern Europe already in the 19th century (Epstein n.d.). The contemporary nature of these journeys was created by the political, economic and technological changes of the last decades. Hasidic pilgrimages, after a period of stagnation lasting from World War II to the 1980s, are developing in a new social context.

³ Other researchers (including Galas 2006, Dynner 2006) also emphasize the internal diversity of this trend, both in relation to its history and the present, arguing that instead of Hasidism, we should speak about “Hasidisms”. As David Assaf explains: “Hasidism is not, and never was, a <<movement>> in the modern sense—a centralized organization. <<Hasidism>> is essentially a collective term for a great variety of groups and subgroups which took shape over the centuries (...). Since the 19th century, Hasidic groups have been identified with the dynasties to which their leaders belong, and they are generally designated by the names of the East-European townships and villages where the <<courts>> of those dynasties were established or first became known (Assaf 2006: 2).

With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the dismantling of the “Eastern bloc”, the tombs of tsaddiks in Ukraine, Poland, Belarus and Lithuania, which for years were unavailable or accessible only to a few pilgrims, have become a real destination for people living permanently in Israel, Western Europe, South America or the United States. This multiplicity of directions from which Hasidim pilgrims come from is a novelty, because before World War II, the tombs of tsaddiks were pilgrimated primarily from Eastern Europe (Epstein n.d.). This is reflected in the language of pilgrimages in the press (Paciorek 2014). Headlines such as: “Hasidim from all over the world come to Poland” or “Jews from all over the world at the tsaddik in Leżajsk” make the peripheral towns famous and suddenly visible in regional, national and even international media.

Shifra Epstein (2002: 110), based on studies conducted since the 1980s, stated that pilgrimages to Poland gradually became an essential part of the holy duties of the Hasidim. In her opinion, “The success of the Hasidic pilgrimage to Poland, which combines religious enthusiasm with tourism in a most original way, reflects the capacity of one segment of the Jewish community to actively resist the challenges and temptations of the modern world” (Epstein 2002: 113). Describing the course of pilgrimages, the author emphasizes that:

The time constraints, particularly for the Americans, are part of the reason that the pilgrimage becomes a real race, whose only goal often seems to be to visit more tombs than are on the itinerary. The groups usually remain an average of 20 minutes at any given site, to the great distress of certain participants who would prefer to visit fewer sites and spend at least half a day at them (Epstein 2002: 108).

The research puts forward the thesis that today’s pilgrimage experience to Poland is what often unites the representatives of individual Hasidic groups, despite their differences of a religious or political nature. As she writes: “The pilgrimage to Poland revitalizes community links and offers a rare occasion for forgetting arguments about how to read certain texts or how to organize rituals. An experience is shared, despite religious or political differences, particularly with respect to the existence of Israel” (Epstein 2002: 109). And further:

During their trip, participants often rediscover that they belong to the wide Hasidic community, beyond the sectarian differences. Indeed, they suddenly have an opportunity to discover their common geographical and ideological origins. Members of different groups

honor the same founders and visit the same sites, and use the same buses (Epstein 2002: 113).

The author explains how it happens that various Hasidic groups, who are sometimes divided by so much, meet at the ohel⁴. However, the tombs of tzaddikim, who enjoy special recognition also attract other groups. Alina Cała (1987, 1995) and Jacek Ołędzki (1989) even described practices related to the cult of tsaddikim among Christians. Some of my non-Hasidic interlocutors in Leżajsk expressed their faith in the tsaddik's power, but such an attitude is rarely present, although current, for example, in Chernivtsi in Ukraine (see Kaspina, Amosova 2009). According to my conversations with several Israelis in Uman, arrivals at the tomb of Nachman of Breslov have transformed into a quasi-tourist mass event, attractive not only to the Hasidim, but also to non-religious Jews who perceive pilgrimage in terms of cultural tourism. During the *yahrzeit* (death anniversary) of the tsaddik, at the ohels in Leżajsk or Lelów, one can find Jews from Western Europe, for whom visits to these places constitute a journey into their own identity, photographers carrying out projects regarding memory, as well as people whom one of my interlocutors (the owner of a Lelovian agri-tourism farm) called "Jewish culture enthusiasts". They visit various places associated with Jewish heritage, and they compare their stay at the *yahrzeit* – usually with a camera in hand – to participation in klezmer concerts and the festival at Kazimierz in Krakow (see Greszta 2016). From the perspective of many such interlocutors, the Hasidic places of worship in Eastern Europe are becoming increasingly important points on the map of Jewish religious and cultural heritage.

Lelów, Leżajsk and Uman – towns visited by Hasidim

For small Lelów (about 2 thousand inhabitants), located in the Silesia Province, in the district of Częstochowa, around 200 pilgrims come to the *yahrzeit* of Dawid Biderman (1746-1814). Before World War II, 50-60% of the inhabitants of the town were Jews, i.e., about 700 people (Gawron 2006). They were deported in 1942 to the Treblinka extermination camp. Edyta Gawron (2006: 38) reports that only a dozen or so people survived among the Jews of Lelów. The Jewish cemetery, along with Dawid Biderman's ohel, was destroyed during the war. The buildings of the Municipal Cooperative were later built there. The synagogue which is adjacent to

⁴ "Ohel (Hebrew, tent, Yiddish, *Ojel*) – a wooden or brick building erected above the grave of an accomplished rabbi or tsaddik and his male descendants" (Jagielski n.d.).

the cemetery was converted into a grain warehouse, and in the 1970s, rebuilt for the needs of the “Galmet” Disabled Cooperative. It was not until the 1980s, after discovering the remains of Dawid Biderman under the floor of Municipal Cooperative’s farm buildings that a room was separated in the warehouse that for years served as an ohel (Walczyk 2006: 80-83, Morawska 2012). With time, efforts were made to demolish the warehouse, fence the area, and an ohel was erected in the place of burial of Dawid Biderman.

The number of pilgrims visiting Leżajsk in winter, a city of fourteen-thousand in the Podkarpackie Province, oscillates between five and seven thousand. They come during the *yahrzeit* of Elimelech of Lizhensk (1717-1787). The ohel, restored after the war in the 1960s (Green n.d.), is located in the Jewish cemetery near the market square. In 1921, Jews constituted around 30% of the inhabitants of Leżajsk, or slightly over 1.5 thousand people. In the 1930s, this number increased to 3 thousand. Most of them were driven east of the San River, to the Soviet occupational zone by the Nazis in 1939. There were 40 families left in Leżajsk, who were settled in Bóźnicza street. With the liquidation of the ghetto created there, its inhabitants were sent to the extermination camp in Belżec and murdered there (Wodziński n.d.) The cemetery was destroyed by the Nazis during the war, and the matzevots were used to harden local roads. A lapidarium was later built at the cemetery from the matzevots found during road works.

Nowadays, the *yahrzeit* celebrations in Lelów and Leżajsk take place in a peaceful atmosphere, although conflicts have occurred in the last dozen or so years⁵. The situation looks differently in Uman, where both, the scale of the pilgrimages and the social tensions are bigger. Uman (87,000 inhabitants), located in the central part of Ukraine, in the Cherkasy Province, is visited once a year for the Rosh Hashanah by nearly 30,000 pilgrims. The purpose of their journey is the tomb of Nachman of Breslov (1772-1811). During the Second World War, of the 22,000 local Jews, the Nazis murdered over 17,000 (Freeze n.a.). The mass graves of the victims are located on the outskirts of Uman in a place called Suchy Jar. The Jewish cemetery, where the tomb of Nachman of Breslov was located, was then destroyed, and the area was developed for housing after the war (Akao 2007: 139). Currently, there is a housing estate of multi-story blocks

⁵ Dorota Paciorek (2014: 276-277) writes about the conflicts surrounding the construction of the Hasidic Center in Leżajsk. In both towns there were instances of devastation or appearances of inscriptions of anti-Semitic character in public spaces. See. <http://www.tvn24.pl/wiadomosci-z-kraju,3/swastyka-na-cmentarzu,51332.html> (29/09/2016), http://czestochowa.wyborcza.pl/czestochowa/1,35271,17517480,krzyczeli_w_Lelowie_wynocha_Zydzi_Prokurator_nie.html (29/09/2016) .

of flats and private houses there. Among these buildings, there is an infrastructure for pilgrims, built around the recovered tomb of the tsaddik (Akao 2007: 139).

The scale of Jewish pilgrimages to Uman causes a number of organizational and logistical problems. In addition, since 1997, protests against Hassidic pilgrimages have been taking place. These tensions are sometimes solved at an international level. An example of this may be the conflict from 1998, in the outcome of which Ukraine refused to issue visas to nearly three-thousand pilgrims from Israel, and the events of 2010, which led to the deportation of 10 Hasidim to Israel for disrupting public order and assaulting citizens of Ukraine. The defendants were banned from entering the territory of Ukraine for the following five years⁶.

The impact of pilgrimages on the communities of Lelów, Leżajsk and Uman

The landscape of the studied places where the traces of a Jewish past have been blurred over the years has changed permanently because of the Hasidic pilgrimages (see Bartosz 2015). The cult of tsaddikim, concentrated around the places of their burial, has become an incentive to renew and re-fence the cemeteries destroyed during or after World War II. Houses of prayer and mikvehs have regained their former functions, and the streets of once Jewish districts are filled with hundreds or thousands of pilgrims once a year. Although the stay of large groups of pilgrims in all these places during the biggest holidays is long (in Uman it usually takes 7-14 days, while in Leżajsk and Lelów it merely takes several days), it can be said that “Jewish neighborhoods” are created in the old shtetls. In Uman it is a large area of the city, called “Uman City” by some of the inhabitants with a sneer, while in Leżajsk and Lelów – small alleys, limited to one or two streets. Here are some excerpts from conversations with the residents of Lelów and Leżajsk:

A: Do you normally go there to look?

R: Yes [smile⁷], but only in the street, they will not let you in inside (...). It's been a few years since they were building this chapel [ohel]. Because it's normally our masters there... [they worked at the construction]. And (...) one of these gentlemen, of these workers said: Well, come on. (...) And Jews happened to be there at the time, right? He says: (...) just

⁶ 6 Data according to the Interfax-Ukraine information agency: <http://en.interfax.com.ua/news/general/48186.html> (29/09/2016) .

⁷ The added information in quotes in square brackets is by the author or other researchers who wrote the transcriptions.

don't laugh. And I [laughter], being the joker I am..., so I looked at this book, he reads it, nods, prays, and suddenly, when he started MIMIMIMI, and how I *burst* into laughter... He looked at me like that and immediately a Jew came and took my hand, and he led me out, right? And I said I was sorry, I am sorry ... I'm very sorry. (...) I could not control myself. I mean, he was, he started their prayer somehow differently, and he immediately jumped out ... (...). I ... I was terrified, because I did not know what was going on, (...) It's obvious that you have to respect it, because God, after all, the Lord Jesus was also a Jew. (...) And now normally, those... who come, right, so I go there to look, to watch... (...) you cannot enter inside, but... but you can walk normally in the street (...) sure that they are watching, watching a person, right? (Lelów, F about 65 Y/A).

I noticed for the second or third year now that fewer and fewer of them [locals] come, but it was a kind of *boom* a few years ago, that when [Hasidim] came on Sunday, for example, when it happened that Jews were here on Sunday, it was so that *Adar* [the interviewee meant a *yahrzeit*, which falls on the 21st of the month of Adar] was on Sunday, it fell on Sunday. Then people from the church went straight, in hoards (...) and everyone watched, it was for them a phenomenon unheard of, something new, people grouped together and there were discussions. Then they got over it (Leżajsk, F about 60 Y/A).

According to these statements, Hasidic pilgrimages create a space in which residents come into contact with cultural difference. These “meetings”, however, are marked by clear manifestations of difference, which in many cases makes closer contact more difficult. The linguistic gap, the lack of interest in contacts with local people on the part of the Hasidim, the reluctance or anti-Semitism of the locals, mutual prejudices, post-war traumas, as well as many other historical, social and cultural factors are not conducive to interaction. As a result, the Hasidic pilgrimage is an opportunity for “meetings” which mainly consist in observing each other from a safe distance. Although the quoted statements refer to the period from about 10 years ago, it is currently also possible to observe small groups of different ages, looking at the festivities near the ohels. During the stay of the Hasidim, conversations among residents, such as: “What are you doing today? Are we going to look at the Jews?” are not uncommon.

Recalling the appearance of the first pilgrims in the 1980s and 1990s, the interlocutors from Lelów and Leżajsk talked about groups of several people asking about the location of the

Jewish cemetery and photographing the area. Part of the memories is the fear for houses and properties, as expressed in the following quote:

- For sure, the first was first and foremost curiosity – people [Lelów's residents] came to watch. Some people were worried about their homes, those in the market, that they could get rid of them ...

- Buy them out or something...

(...)

- I'm not a racist, but they are strangers who still feel at home here, that they are still entitled to something here. Such feelings from earlier [years], it was talked about more than once that they were asking around about the documents of these buildings, about these things, the conclusion was, I don't know the details, that they would like to regain it (Lelów, F ca. 60 Y/A).

In the postwar years, Jewish places in Leżajsk and Lelów – houses, shops and workshops, synagogues, baths and cemeteries – changed owners. These processes are described, among others, by Andrzej Leder (2013), Marcin Zaremba (2012) and authors of texts contained in the volume *Klucze i kasa: O mieniu żydowskim w Polsce...* (Grabowski, Libionka, eds, 2014). In her speech, the interviewee clearly referred to the earlier phase of the development of the pilgrimage movement. Our research shows that these fears are not so vivid these days. A more comprehensive answer to the question about their timeliness will be possible after the completion of the analysis of the materials gathered. It is worth noting, however, that a large proportion of people who are living in the central regions of Lelów and Leżajsk today, live in Jewish houses or new buildings erected in their place.

As I have already mentioned, the scale of Hasidic pilgrimages in Uman is much greater than in Poland. The popularity of Uman on the map of Hasidic places of pilgrimage makes the city a popular destination with pilgrim groups all year round, and the time devoted to preparations for Rosh Hashanah and the cleaning and dismantling of infrastructure after pilgrims departure is counted in months. The Hasidic pilgrimage is also built into the local economy on the micro-level: small trade has developed, residents rent flats and houses to pilgrims, put up new

buildings for rent, provide service work and cleaning services. In spite of the economic benefits, my interlocutors from Uman expressed their concerns about their homes and their neighborhood, justifying them predominantly with the corruption of the representatives of the authorities, who – according to many people whom I have talked to – allow for “Hassidic expansion” and “seizing of territory” for private benefits

Ciulim-Czulent Festival in Lelów

The festival “Lelowskie Spotkania Kultur – Święto Ciulim-Czulentu” [Eng. Lelów cultural meetings – Ciulim-Czulent festival] has been held in Lelów since the early 2000s. This event, in its modern shape, is built around two dishes – the “local ciulim” and “Jewish chulent”⁸. One of the aims of the festival is, according to the organizers, to commemorate the Jewish community of Lelów and the Polish-Jewish neighborhood. During the festival, the ohel of Dawid Biderman that has been built recently is made available as a local “monument” that can be visited with a guide. A small Hasidic delegation would come every year for the “Jewish day” (Sunday) of the festival. They prepared the chulent and offered it to the festival’s attendants. Although today’s visits of Hasidic guests are limited to making a short speech on the festival stage, it is clear from my research that their presence is interpreted by the organizers and local authorities as a sign of good Polish-Jewish relations in Lelów, both today and in the past. What is supposed to connect Hasidic pilgrims, the destroyed Jewish community and contemporary residents of Lelów, is the *ciulim*, which, according to a local legend, is derived from the chulent.

The practice of inscribing Hasidic pilgrimages into the framework of the local cultural heritage is also manifested in publications, such as, *Chasydzi lelowscy. Spotkania w drodze* (Skrzypczyk, Wieczorek 2008), or *Lelów na skrzyżowaniu szlaków i kultur* (Ranuszkiewicz 2014). They constitute tools by means of which a local brand is created and the image of the municipality is shaped. Based on the examples of these practices, the mechanisms of constructing heritage are clearly visible, understood as a process and “a kind of a tool that allows to organize the available cultural material and make a selection of it in such a way that the identity becomes

⁸ *Czulent* (Eng. chulent) is one of the most recognizable dishes of Jewish cuisine. The cultural significance of this dish is interpreted by scholars in religious terms, linking the chulent with the symbolism of a Sabbath meal (e.g. Mason 2008). On the other hand, *ciulim* is a local Lelowian dish, which is on the list of traditional products of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. What connects *ciulim* with the chulent is their preparation (many hours of baking in a bread oven). At the same time, both dishes are significantly different from each other (e.g. in terms of their ingredients) (Gmyz 2016; Zatorska 2015a).

credible thanks to embedding it in specific elements of contemporary cultural reality recognized as manifestations of the past” (Klekot 2014: 47). In Polish cities and towns, the practices of constructing local cultural heritage form part of broader processes related to the impact of national and EU identity policies, regional development strategies and the discourse of “unity in diversity”, promoting the idea of multiculturalism in local activities (Kurczewska, Bojar, eds., 2009).

The atmosphere of the Ciulim-Czulent Festival, which I had the opportunity to observe twice in 2014 and 2015, resembles a joyful picnic integrating the local community. The organizers emphasize the convivial nature of the event, which is also confirmed by the interviews that we have conducted with the inhabitants of Lelów. For many residents this holiday is, above all, an opportunity to meet with neighbors, friends and family and have fun together (see Gmyz 2016; Kwiatkowska 2016).

During the festival, Jewishness is presented in a folkloristic manner – with the help of music played on the festival stage, Jewish dance workshops and dishes of Jewish cuisine, which can be purchased at stands in the gastronomical area of the festival. Folklorisation is associated with the commercial aspect of the festival. Its result is a construction of Jewishness which essentializes and objectifies it, and leads to its commodification. As Jean and John Comaroff point out, these three processes – essentialization, objectification and commodification – are often intertwined and condition each other (Comaroff, Comaroff 2011). The most eminent example of this are the controversial souvenirs offered during the festival at the stalls of private vendors. They use a rather narrow spectrum of “Jewish” themes: they are souvenirs with the motifs of the Star of David or the menorah, and most of all, the images of a “Jew with money” in the form of figurines, pictures and magnets. The social context in which the aesthetic dimension of this type of objects is shaped is described by Olga Goldberg-Mulkiewicz:

Such sculptures are starting to be bought by ethnographic museums, and in their collections, the figurine of a Jew in traditional clothing often becomes the only or one of the few images showing the lost local culture. (...) According to the rules governing the creation of the souvenir market, sculptors adapted to the requirements and expectations of potential clients, which affected the reception and implementation of the topic. Today, under the influence of the domestic and tourist markets, the figure of Jew is being

conventionalized in both iconographic and thematic terms. Sculptors duplicate the learned pattern dozens of times, without engaging creatively. The Jewish stereotype becomes unified. The most catchy image is the pseudo-Hasid, or rather a Jew in a prayer outfit, or a group of klezmers (Goldberg-Mulkiewicz 2014: 188-189)⁹.

I would like to juxtapose Goldberg-Mulkiewicz's diagnosis with a statement of an interlocutor from Lelów, who comments on the first visits of Hasidim to the tomb of Dawid Biderman:

The beginnings were such that when they came here, well... then... people were coming down here from villages just to look, because they remembered from earlier times, then... you could see what a Jew looked like, they have their prayers and so on, but these younger generations, they would come out of curiosity (Lelów, M approx. 50 Y/A).

This statement shows that the inclusion of Hasidim into the local cultural heritage plan is successful partly due to the functioning of a particular canon of representations in popular culture (which in fact reinforces cultural stereotypes). It is clearly visible that this is a selective process based on the example of the attitude of the inhabitants of Lelów to local Jewish cemeteries. There are two Jewish burial places in Lelów. The first one is the so-called old cemetery in Ogrodowa Street, where Dawid Biderman's ohel is located. The cemetery was re-fenced after demolishing part of the buildings of the Municipal Cooperative a few years ago. On the other hand, on the town's border in the direction of Szczekociny, there is a so-called new Jewish cemetery, created in the 19th century. Destroyed during the Second World War or after it, for years it was a cultivated field; today it is unused and covered in meadow. Although Lelów has been talking about commemorating this place for many years (Walczyk 2006: 83), currently there are no signs there informing about its status. Our research shows that although the cemetery at Ogrodowa Street, along with the ohel, is often treated by the town's residents as local heritage, the so-called new Jewish cemetery is very rarely classified in this category (see Gwiazdowicz 2016).

The organizers of the festival are trying to change the way of thinking about "Polishness" and "Jewishness" as two separate identities that stems from the convention of the festival, and is expressed in the division of the festival attractions into a "Polish day" (Saturday) and "Jewish

⁹ Translation is mine – Z.B.

day” (Sunday). For several years now, the festival program has included a film night (on Friday), during which films on Jewish or Polish-Jewish topics are screened and discussions moderated by a philosopher from the Jagiellonian University are held. The Lełów Historical and Cultural Association organizes conferences and also publishes scientific or popular-scientific works, including the history of the town’s Jewish community (e.g. Galas, Skrzypczyk, eds., 2006). The local and Jewish heritage are also areas for negotiating of what is common and what is different, as shown by the cultural functioning of the *ciulim*, which appears on Lelowian tables not only on the occasion of the festival, and is an important part of the town’s identity (see Gmyz 2016; Zatorska 2015a).

Internet photo stories from Leżajsk

In the early 2000s, the idea of the local festival was born in Leżajsk, among other towns and cities. In 2002, the Jewish Culture Festival “Kwitelech” [Eng. Kvitel] was organized¹⁰, which after two editions was transformed into the “Three Cultures Meeting” – Polish, Ukrainian and Jewish. The city also issues publications promoting the commune, in which descriptions of Hasidism and contemporary pilgrimages are interwoven into the narrative of Leżajsk’s “multiculturalism” based on similar principles to the ones in Lełów (Ziemia Leżajska 2010; Fąfara, Krzykwa 2010).

However, what distinguishes Leżajsk from other Polish towns visited by Hasidim is a very large and constantly expanding online collection of photographs and short films documenting the pilgrimages. The analysis of the materials available online indicates that the photographs are published by people who are both photography amateurs and professionals. They are often bloggers or users of photographic websites that serve to exchange information and experiences, as well as to promote their own work. The example below shows how this happens:

mydło 93: Does anyone know when exactly a mass of Hasidim will come to Leżajsk this year? Maybe someone knows, because the Leżajsk City Hall does not respond even to e-mails.

¹⁰ Kwitelech, Eng. Kvitel, pl. kvitelach, were cards handed over to tsaddikim or laid on their graves. On kvitelach Jews going to the tsaddik for advice would write the name of their mother and their own, and also the request they came with (Fijałkowski n.d.)

tomfoot: 21st day of the month of Adar.

lucek 92: So probably the culmination will happen on March 1st. I'm still waiting for a confirmation.

tomfoot: Exactly. This year, the most important day for Hasidim will take place on March 1.

lucek 92: Who from this chat group is going? Do you have any photos from previous years? Show them off.

[in response Keek sends a link to a gallery with photos from 2005 and 2010]

lucek 92: Many thanks, beautiful photos! I hope they do not cover the entrance to the Ohel with a nasty white tent like they did last year.

Keek: I did not know that they were doing that now. But I guess they do not forbid entry? In 2010 I almost came up to the tomb itself. "Almost", because it was so crowded that I could not get through.

lucek92: You can enter. It's true it's hard to get to the tomb, but usually the next day some of them still stay and then you can take nice photos inside¹¹.

These people are only seemingly from somewhere else. Although the majority of photographers taking photos during the yahrzeit come from outside of Leżajsk, the materials and interviews conducted indicate that thanks to online communication, an environment of reporters (mainly amateurs) interested in the Hassidic pilgrimages is created that operates independently of their place of residence. Though Lełów attracts a smaller group of photographers, you can sometimes meet the same people at the yahrzeits in both places. Here is a fragment of the conversation:

- I am curious, what are you actually doing here?

- Hmm... I saw one photo from Lełów. My friend's... on Facebook. So I asked, "why wasn't I there?". Huh! And he offered me a trip to Leżajsk (Leżajsk, M about 60 Y/A)

¹¹ <http://forum.nikoniarze.pl/showthread.php?t=269396>, comments published in the period 31/01/2016-12/02/2016 (23/10/2016). Dialogues and online postings are quoted according to the original spelling.

Most materials about the Hasidim in Leżajsk (and also about the town's Jewish community) can be found on the website of a resident of the city, Anna Ordyczyńska, who is around sixty years old. She runs several blogs and websites, including <http://chasydzi.blogspot.com/> and <http://aord.republika.pl/>, on which she has been publishing audiovisual materials documenting the pilgrimages for several years. At the beginning of her activity, she speaks in the following way:

I went to school here, to primary school and high school, and I had no idea that Jews have here... I did not know at all who the tsaddik was, and not only me. (...) My friends who lived in the city, in the market, did not know either. (...) And when I got married, I moved and it turned out that my mother-in-law, they knocked on her windows at night, at midnight, Jews. (...) And I started to get interested in it and it turns out that my mother-in-law had the key to this Ohel, where she cleaned and spoke Yiddish with them. So why in Yiddish? Well, because all her life she lived there in that street, [it] was a typical Jewish street. (...) She wrote to me, my school-friend from France, who lived in the city, in the city center. (...) She says: listen, my mother stayed in Leżajsk, she calls me and says that there are so many Hasidim coming here. A lot of Jews. What is happening, etc. So I started writing (...) and then I thought: (...) why should I just pass it on to her? (...) So then I set up this web page about Jews and started to write.

The interviewee is aware of the impact of the materials she publishes online. As she declares, she has often been approached by people from outside of Leżajsk who visited her website, asking for the date of the yahrzeit in a given year and other information related to this event. As a result of her activities, Anna Ordyczyńska became, as she says, “the one who knows about Jews” in Leżajsk. Thanks to her popularizing activities, more and more people come to the yahrzeit who explain their presence at the ohel with curiosity of – to use the expression of another blogger quoted below – “a different culture”:

Travel is for us [the author of the entry and her family] a way of life. By traveling you get to know interesting places, different cultures and customs. We learn respect for the traditions of other nations and religions. However, you do not necessarily have to fly thousands of kilometers to find yourself in a different world. Sometimes, next to us, we can discover a different and exotic world. This is how it is in Leżajsk, a small town in the

Podkarpacie region. (...) We have wanted to go to Leżajsk for a long time in the time when Hasidim go there. Finally it worked. When we came close to the Jewish cemetery, it was as if suddenly time went back by a hundred years. We were surrounded by festive-dressed men in black cloaks, white stockings and fur hats. It was Saturday, that is, the Sabbath¹².

It is also shown in the following quotes from interlocutors:

Well, they are curious, right? In themselves. They are characteristic. I would not say that they are different, but characteristic. Well, I'm fascinated by tradition so... I admire, that's right. That they stick to tradition, which many of us as if lack in are actions (Leżajsk, M ca. 60 Y/A).

My mother also told me a lot, when we would talk, that Jews were walking with these payots. How does a peasant with payots walk?! Well, now I see! Now I see. There is a dagger, and here are the payots. Because they are called payots, not sidelocks, but payots. (...) Some of them have them beautifully wrapped, because this one is wearing them rather sluggishly (Leżajsk, M approx. 40 Y/A).

We just came to see something that does not exist in other parts of Poland. I came across this for the first time. You do not have to go to Israel to see the Jews! (...) Live it looks better than on Youtube. Ha, ha! There's an ambiance. It's as if you'd gone back to pre-war times. Apart from the view from the outside, I have the impression, I see a Jewish dress as if it was before the war (Leżajsk, F approx. 40 Y/A).

Although the motivations of people going to the Ohel to see Hasidic pilgrimages are often much more complex than those presented above (see: Greszta 2016), as a result of the development of the possibility of publishing their own, often amateur photojournalism, a special group of social actors shaping the perception of the Hasidic pilgrimage is created. Accompanied by a nostalgic image of the former shtetl, which is indicated both by the interviewee's words: "fascinating tradition", "climate as before the war", "as if it was before the war", "as if time went back a hundred years", and the photographs published by them.

Protests against Hasidim in Uman

¹² <http://kasai.eu/2014/chasydzi-w-lezajsku/>, entry on the blog of 26/03/2016 (23/10/2016)

The development of the pilgrimage movement and the scale it has reached in recent years have radically changed the character of Uman. With the resettlement of some Ukrainian families living in the immediate vicinity of the burial place of Nachman of Breslov, “Hasidic life” began to develop in the “Hasidic neighborhood”. There are residential houses, hotels, and several shops offering kosher products, bookstores, cafes and one of the largest synagogues in Europe. Hasidism organizations or private investors have acquired many properties in this area of the city, flats and houses, which today they rent out to pilgrims. Despite these changes, the burial place of the tsaddik and its surroundings is a space inhabited by or visited by permanent residents of Uman on a daily basis. It is most visible during the Rosh Hashanah, which usually falls in September. During this time, the inhabitants of the region are obliged to observe a number of rules, for example, women are recommended to wear modest clothing, covering their whole bodies. They also cannot trade in the immediate vicinity of Nachman. Admission to the district during Rosh Hashanah, apart from pilgrims, is only granted to the residents of this part of the city, employees and journalists. All these groups must have passes issued by the mayor or press IDs (in the case of journalists). However, women are not always successful in passing through the police gate near Nachman’s tomb – they are usually directed to another entrance. These and other limitations imposed on residents, enforced by the police and military troops instilling order in the district during the festival, as well as the above-mentioned transformation of the town’s landscape constitute the source of disputes on the subject of space in Uman.

One of the conflicts that has lasted many years concerns the monument of Ivan Gonta Maksym Zalizniak, the leaders of the Koliyivshchyna, or the rebellion of the Cossacks and Russian peasants against the Polish nobility, which took place in 1768-1769. Gonta and Zalizniak were responsible for the murder of the Jewish and Polish population of Uman (the so-called Uman slaughter of 1768). Both, often portrayed as criminals in Polish historical literature, are considered by national Ukrainian activists as national heroes. From this perspective, Uman is a symbol of the national-liberation struggle against the political hegemony of Poles and Jews (perceived as allies of the Polish masters). However, the same historical event is the reason why Uman has become a symbolic place for Jews. Nachman moved there from Breslov a few months before his death, because he wanted to be buried in the Jewish cemetery in Uman, in order to commemorate the victims of the massacre. The local authorities, trying to satisfy the local nationalist circles, gave their consent for the construction of the monument of Ivan Gonta and

Maksym Zalizniak, but for many years they blocked its erection, fearing to offend the pilgrims. The monument was erected in autumn 2015 thanks to the funds obtained from of a charity organized by people associated with the Council of Civil Organizations in Uman.

Another event which was widely discussed during one of my stays in Uman was the conflict over the access road leading to blocks of flats inhabited by Ukrainians, and located near the tomb of Nachman. The road was closed because the territory on both sides was bought by entities investing in infrastructure for pilgrims. The unification of both properties was explained by the investors and authorities as logistical considerations and plans for creating a large area to cater to the needs of visitors, adding that there is a different route available to the inhabitants of the blocks. Despite long-term negotiations between residents, representatives of the Hasidic community and local authorities, no agreement was reached. In the end, a group of local activists took action off their own accord and pulled down a new high fence connecting the plots on both sides of the road.

As Michel de Certeau claims, thanks to the distinction between “space” and “place”, a performative dimension of spatiality can be captured. While “a place (*lieu*) is the order (of whatever kind) in accord with which elements are distributed in relationships of coexistence”, “space is composed of intersections of mobile elements”. The place is “an instantaneous configuration of positions. It implies an indication of stability”, while space is the “practiced place” (De Certeau 1984: 117). The dispute concerning the road shows how a place – constituted by a fence delineating the boundaries of the space, thanks to the fact that it becomes a part of the activity, changes into a space understood as a practiced place and “spatializes” order, whose durability was defended by local structures of economic and political domination in Uman.

The city authorities justified changes in the local infrastructure, such as placing a fence across the road and excluding it from traffic, with arguments about the development of tourism. Speaking about the Hasidim as “tourists”, officials and some representatives of the local media explained the inconvenience with economic benefit. However, as Akao aptly points out, relations between pilgrims and residents are far from the model relationship of tourists – hosts. The reason for this is the fact that the Hasidim rarely treat Uman as a place where they could fulfill their tourist needs; in general, they are not interested in Ukrainian culture, local traditions or local history, and as a result, Ukrainian hosts have no way of showing their own culture to the

“visiting” guests. They become rather observers who look at Hasidic traditions, dances and songs. Therefore, according to the researcher, the relationship between tourists and hosts is disturbed (Akao 2007: 150). This thesis is confirmed by the experiences of my interlocutors, employees of the Local History Museum, who unsuccessfully tried to attract Hasidic “tourists” by the introduction of themes on Hasidic history and culture in Uman to the permanent exhibition.

At the end of his article, Akao stresses that the tense situation in Uman is changing. In his opinion, the relations between the Hasidim and the local community are improving and stabilizing over time, and the ever-better mutual understanding is to be a result, on the one hand, of growing interest of the pilgrims with local culture, and on the other hand – getting used to the pilgrimages by the inhabitants. The author quotes the words of a representative of the commune office: “And the residents of Uman are already accustomed to the idea that Hasidim are ours, that they come to us and that Uman and Hasidim are inseparable” (Akao 2007: 151).

In my opinion, however, this interpretation is too optimistic, taking into account the events of the last few years. The discourse on cultural tourism, present in the press, media and official statements of city hall representatives is undergoing a particular “reversal” as a result of the actions of a group of local activists. Almost ten years after Akao’s research, they began formal protests against Hasidic pilgrimages. Since 2010, activists of local civic organizations have been organizing a “March against Chasidic arbitrariness in Uman”, as well as other actions in the city’s space¹³.

Local authorities banned the demonstrations in 2012, but the organizers called an assembly under the pretext of meeting a local councilor. The protesters were encouraging the residents of Uman to “actively defend”, and to “become the hosts of their own city”. They pointed to the following problems that Hassidic pilgrimages to Uman are supposed to generate: lack of water, disorder and rubbish left by pilgrims, corruption and illegal sale of land and property. The problem raised most often – both by the organizers of the protests and some of my other interlocutors – concerns “Hasidic identity”. The interviewees claim that Hasidim are aggressive, they do not obey the local law and do not respect local customs.

¹³ A conflict over a cross over the pond where the pilgrims pray was widely covered in foreign press. I describe this event in another article (Zatorska 2015b).

Although one cannot project the attitudes towards the Hasidic pilgrimages presented by the members of the Council of Civic Organizations to the whole community of Uman, as my research shows, many people support their initiatives. The process of “Hassidic expansion” is described by a student from Uman in the following way:

Listen, Hasidic expansion began after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Because during the time of the Soviet Union, literally five-hundred, or one-thousand Hasidim came here. And because of the fact that the state was then quite different, there was strict control, they brought them there – they saw and went. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the flow gradually began to increase, the Hasidim in Israel themselves saw that money can be made on this, and the authorities themselves saw that it is possible to make money [the interlocutor means corruption], and they began to advertise it, and the pilgrimage movement began to grow (Uman, M ca. 20 Y/A).

As a result of the practices undertaken by the groups described in this chapter, the method of constructing the Jewish heritage is reversed. The discourse on the economic benefit of tourism, created and propagated by the authorities, is replaced by the rhetoric of an external “invasion”. The use of this metaphor by the organizers and supporters of the protests is supposed to be visible in the lack of respect of Hassidim visitors for the local law, which was clearly communicated on posters and leaflets, calling for participation in the “March against Hassidic arbitrariness in Uman” in 2010, with the help of a game-based comment: “They are already here”.

* * *

The practices of constructing local heritage in Lelów and Leżajsk, as well as protests against Hasidim in Uman (aimed not only at pilgrims, but also at local authorities), are just some of the local “responses” to the development of Hasidic pilgrimages. The attitudes of the individuals and collectives described by me certainly belong to the most expressive ones that are the most easily perceived. They are written in the public space – during official ceremonies (Ciulim-Czulent Festival), on the Internet (Anna Ordyczyńska’s blog), and as part of public protests (activities of the Council of Civic Organizations). The actors who initiate them formally or informally represent the local community outside and give themselves the right to act on its behalf.

The methods of presenting the Hasidic presence in Lelów, Leżajsk and Uman, emerging from these practices and statements can be captured using two metaphors. One of them is the “return”, in which the myth of the shtetl is reactivated, and Hasidic pilgrims are perceived as Jews visiting the graves of their ancestors and restoring the world that was destroyed by the war. This perspective removes the Holocaust from the field of view in a discreet way. It does not allow for the problematizing of Polish-Jewish relations and showing them in other colors than “compatible coexistence” in mythical “pre-war times”. It remains consistent with a mythicized and simplified vision of multiculturalism, based on which local heritage is sometimes constructed. The second perspective is based on the idea of the “invasion” of strangers, treated as a threat to be opposed. In the case of Uman, it is deeply rooted in a lack of trust in power, perceived as corrupt and not caring for citizens.

The metaphors of “return” and “invasion” do not, however, allow to capture the diverse attitudes of residents of the analyzed cities to the Hasidim and the multilayered nature of the problems that are not articulated by the social actors in the “foreground” described above. I hope that further research will enable us to present the other voices of residents of Lelów, Leżajsk and Uman, ones which are harder to hear.

REFERENCES

- Akao M.
2007 *A New Phase in Jewish-Ukrainian Relations?*, “East European Jewish Affairs” 37: 2, pp. 137-155.
- Assaf D.
2006 *Chasydyzm: zarys historii*, trans. E Zwolska, in: M. Galas (ed.), *Światło i słońce. Studia z dziejów chasydyzmu*, Kraków: Austeria, pp. 11-38. English translation available at: <https://pl.scribd.com/document/57550398/History-of-Hasidism-David-Assaf>.
- Baer M.
n.d. *”Inność” w antropologicznym ujęciu krytycznym*, http://opposite.uni.wroc.pl/2010/artykuly_2010/2_Baer.pdf (20.10.2016).
- Bartosz A.
2015 *Galicyjskim szlakiem chasydów sądecko-bobowskich*, co-authors. E. Długosz,

I. Zawidzka; Kraków, Budapeszt: Austeria.

Cała A.

1987 *Wizerunek Żyda w Polskiej kulturze ludowej*, Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski.

1995 *The Cult of Tzaddikim among Non-Jews in Poland*, "Jewish Folklore and Ethnology Review" 17: 1-2, pp. 16-19.

Ciałowicz A.

2006 *W cadykowym dworze. Sadagora: życie i obyczaj*, in: M. Galas (ed.), *Światło i słońce. Studia z dziejów chasydyzmu*, Kraków: Austeria, pp. 173-189.

Comaroff J., Comaroff J.L.

2009 *Ethnicity, Inc.*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

De Certeau M.

1984 *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkely: The University of California Press.

Dynner G.

2006 *Men of Silk: The Hasidic Conquest of Polish Jewish Society*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Epstein S.

2002 *Hasidic Pilgrimages in Poland*, D. Neumann, R. Arditti (eds.), *Jewish Cultures and European Judaism: Different Faces of the European Judaism. A Selection of Texts*. Paris: European Association of Jewish Culture, The Alliance Israélite Universelle, pp. 100-115.

n.d. *Pilgrimage*, w: *The YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe*, <http://www.yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Pilgrimage> (14.09.2016).

Fąfara J. J., Krzykwa A.

2010 *Chasydzi w Leżajsku. Hassids of Leżajsk. Chassidim in Leżajsk*, Rzeszów: Podkarpacki Instytut Książki i Marketingu.

Fijałkowski P.

n.d. *Kwitlech*, in: *Polski Słownik Judaistyczny*, <http://www.jhi.pl/psj/kwitlech> (24.10.2016).

Freeze Ch.

n.d. *Uman*, in: *YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe*, <http://www.yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Uman> (20.10.2016).

Galas M.

2006 *Chasydyzm czy chasydyzmy? Główne aspekty dziejów mistyki żydowskiej*

na ziemiach polskich, in: M. Galas, M. Skrzypczyk (eds.), *Żydzi lelowscy. Obecność i ślady*, Kraków: Austeria, pp. 47-64.

Galas M., Skrzypczyk M. (eds.)

2006 *Żydzi lelowscy. Obecność i ślady*, Kraków: Austeria.

Gawron E.

2006 *Lelowscy Żydzi w XIX i XX wieku*, in: M. Galas, M. Skrzypczyk (eds.), *Żydzi lelowscy. Obecność i ślady*, Kraków: Austeria, pp. 27-45.

Goldberg-Mulkiewicz O.

2014 *Zmiany stereotypu „obcego”. Figurka postaci Żyda na polskim rynku*, in: E. Lehrer (ed.), *Na szczęście to Żyd. Polskie figurki Żydów / Lucky Jews: Poland's Jewish Figurines*, trans. A. Bilewicz, Kraków: Korporacja Ha!art, pp. 186-189.

Grabowski J., Libionka D. (eds.)

2014 *Klucze i kasa: O mieniu żydowskim w Polsce pod okupacją niemiecką i we wczesnych latach powojennych 1939-1950*, Warszawa: Stowarzyszenie Centrum Badań nad Zagładą Żydów.

Green A.

n.d. *Elimelekh of Lizhensk*, w: *The YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe*, http://www.yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Elimelekh_of_Lizhensk (29.09.2016).

Gmyz K.

2016 *Tradycja, tożsamość, smak. Znaczenia i praktyki wokół ciulimu lelowskiego*, <http://kulturaoddolna.pl/znaczenia-i-praktyki-wokol-ciulimu-lelowskiego/> (17.10.2016).

Greszta A.

2016 *„Ja tu tylko patrzę”. Pielgrzymi, obserwatorzy, gapie*, <http://kulturaoddolna.pl/ja-tu-tylko-patrze/> (4.07.2016).

Gwiazdowicz A.

2016 *Tam łąka rośnie, a po cmentarzu nie ma żydowskim ani śladu. O pamięci i zapomnieniu w Lelowie*, <http://kulturaoddolna.pl/o-pamieci-i-zapomnieniu-w-lelowie/> (17.10.2016).

Jagielski J.

n.d. *Ohel*, in: *Polski Słownik Judaistyczny*, <http://www.jhi.pl/psj/ohel> (20.09.2016).
Kaspina M., Amosova A.

- 2009 *Paradoks mežetničeskikh kontaktov: praktika obrašenia niejevrejev v sinagogu (po polevym materialam)*, „Antropologičeskij Forum Online” 11, pp. 1-24, http://anthropologie.kunstkamera.ru/files/pdf/011online/11_online_04_kaspina-amosova.pdf (06.10.2016).
- Klekot E.
- 2014 *Polityczny wymiar dziedzictwa kultury*, in: G. Michałowska, J. Nakonieczna, H. Schreiber (ed.), *Kultura w stosunkach międzynarodowych*, vol. 2, Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 46-62.
- Kurczewska J., Bojar H. (eds.)
- 2009 *Wyciskanie Brukselki? O europeizacji społeczności lokalnych na pograniczach*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii PAN.
- Kwiatkowska W.
- 2016 *(Od)grywanie żydowskości. Muzyka jako narzędzie konstruowania tożsamości*, <http://kulturaoddolna.pl/muzyka-a-tozsamosc/> (17.10.2016).
- Leder A.
- 2013 *Prześlona rewolucja: Ćwiczenia z logiki historycznej*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej.
- Mason E.
- 2008 *Cooking the Books. Jewish Cuisine and the Commodification of Difference*, in: K. LeBesco, P. Naccarato (eds.), *Edible Ideologies. Representing Food and Meaning*, Albany: State University of New York Press, pp. 105-125.
- Morawska L.
- 2012 *Lelov: Cultural Memory and a Jewish Town in Poland. Investigating the Identity and History of an Ultra-Orthodox Society*, University of Bradford eThesis (praca doktorska), <http://bradscholars.brad.ac.uk:8080/bitstream/handle/10454/7827/L.Morawska%20PhD.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y> (06.10.2016).
- Olędzki J.
- 1989 *Kwitlechy z Leżajską. Prośba i dziękczynienie w kultach chasydzkich i katolickich*, „Konteksty. Polska Sztuka Ludowa” 43: 1-2, pp. 23-26.
- Paciorek D.
- 2014 *Pielgrzymki chasydów. Media lokalne o pielgrzymkach chasydów na groby cadyków*, in: E. Prokop-Janiec (ed.), *Polacy – Żydzi. Kontakty kulturowe i literackie*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, pp. 273-

- Ranuszkiewicz W.
2014 *Lelów na skrzyżowaniu szlaków i kultur*, Bydgoszcz: Wydawnictwo camVERS.
- Rapoport-Albert A.
1991 *God and the Zaddik as the Two Focal Points of Hasidic Worship*, in: G.D. Hundert (ed.), *Essential Papers on Hasidism: Origins to Present*, New York, London: New York University Press, pp. 299-329.
- Scholem G.
1995 [1946] *Major trends in Jewish mysticism*, New York: Schocken Books.
- Simmel G.
1971 *Stranger*, in: G. Simmel, *On individuality and social forms*, Donald N. Levine (ed.), Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 143-149.
- Skrzypczyk M., Wieczorek A.
2008 *Chasydzi lelowscy. Spotkania w drodze*, Lelów: Gminny Ośrodek Kultury.
- Walczyk A.
2006 *Pamięć i upamiętnienie Żydów w Lelowie*, in: M. Galas, M. Skrzypczyk (ed.), *Żydzi lelowscy. Obecność i ślady*, Kraków: Austeria, pp. 75-103.
- Wodziński M.
n.d. *Leżajsk, The YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe*, <http://www.yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Lezajsk> (19.10.2016).
- Zaremba M.
2012 *Wielka trwoga. Polska 1944-1947. Ludowa reakcja na kryzys*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo „Znak”, Instytut Studiów Politycznych Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Zatorska M.
2015a *Ciulim lelowski jako lokalne dziedzictwo jedzeniowe*, in: S. Sikora, K. Dudek (eds.), *Oddolne tworzenie kultury. Perspektywa antropologiczna*, Warszawa: Instytut Etnologii i Antropologii Kulturowej UW, pp. 86-95, http://kulturaoddolna.pl/blogs/Kultura_Oddolna.pdf (17.07.2016).
- 2015b *Relacje chrześcijańsko-żydowskie w modelu antagonistycznej tolerancji. Od wspólnoty religijnej do wspólnoty pamięci*, „Konteksty. Polska Sztuka Ludowa” 69: 3, pp. 206-219.
- Ziemia Leżajska...*

2010 *Ziemia Leżajska. The land of Leżajsk*, Leżajsk, Warszawa: Wydział Promocji,
Kultury i Współpracy Międzynarodowej w Starostwie Powiatowym
w Leżajsku; Foto Liner.

Internet sources:

Interfax – Ukraine

<http://en.interfax.com.ua/news/general/48186.html> (29.09.2016).

<http://www.tvn24.pl/wiadomosci-z-kraju,3/swastyka-na-cmentarzu,51332.html>
(29.09.2016).

http://czestochowa.wyborcza.pl/czestochowa/1,35271,17517480,Krzyczeli_w_Lelowie_wynocha_Zydzi_Prokurator_nie.html (29.09.2016).

Nikoniarze.pl

<http://forum.nikoniarze.pl/showthread.php?t=269396> (23.10.2016).

Kasai – travel adicts

<http://kasai.eu/2014/chasydzi-w-lezajsku/> (23.10.2016).

Chasydzi w Leżajsku

<http://chasydzi.blogspot.com/> (23.10.2016).

Anna Ordyczyńska

<http://aord.republika.pl/> (23.10.2016).