

die Fälle ekstatischer Frömmigkeit „in den Entstehungszusammenhang des Ultramontanismus in den 1830er und 1840er Jahren“ (S. 127) ein.

Im letzten Unterkapitel werden die wunderbaren Erscheinungen aus staatlicher Perspektive betrachtet. Dabei wird das Problem der staatlichen Religionspolitik König Ludwigs I. angesichts des starken Eigeninteresses der katholischen Kirche deutlich sowie die Schwierigkeiten, die bei der Durchsetzung allgemeiner Normen vor Ort auftreten konnten.

Insgesamt stellt vorliegendes Buch, welches aus einer Magisterarbeit hervorgegangen ist, die im Wintersemester 2001/2002 am Historischen Seminar der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität eingereicht wurde, einen wichtigen Beitrag zur Erforschung katholischer Frömmigkeit im 19. Jahrhundert in ihren Verflechtungen mit geschlechter- und herrschaftsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhängen dar. Man hätte vielleicht den einen oder anderen Akzent anders setzen können – wie z. B. die manipulierende Funktion des Beichtvaters für solche Erscheinungen stärker zu hinterfragen –, aber dies ergibt sich aus der Quellenlage des Einzelfalls und erscheint hier nicht als Wiederholung zeitgenössischer Vorurteile. Insgesamt fällt die Arbeit durch eine wohlthuende Bemühung um mehrere Perspektiven auf. Dafür wurden umfangreiche Archivbestände ausgewertet. Ein umfassendes Literaturverzeichnis sowie ein Personen- und Ortsregister sind enthalten. Die gut lesbare Studie sei hiermit mit Nachdruck empfohlen.

Nicole Priesching

Michael G. Müller/Rolf Petri (eds.), *Die Nationalisierung von Grenzen. Zur Konstruktion nationaler Identität in sprachlich gemischten Grenzregionen*

Marburg: Verlag Herder Institut 2002, 232 Seiten + XVI.

Too many historians of nationalism, even ardent constructionists, start their investigations with the underlying question “what is a nation?” Rogers Brubaker, who made the above observation in a 1996 collection of essays entitled “Nationalism Reframed”, points out that “the very terms in which [the question] is framed presuppose the existence of the entity that is to be defined.” Those who purport to analyze nations from this position, asserts Brubaker, end up adopting “categories of practice as categories

of analysis. [They take] a conception inherent in the *practice* of nationalism and in the workings of the modern state and state-system – namely the realist and reifying conception of nations as real communities – and [they make] this conception central to the *theory* of nationalism.” This observation is almost a decade old, yet it still applies to the massive historical literature on nationalism which is published every year and shows no sign of abating in the near future. It is a special characteristic of those who study nationalism, that they can rarely liberate themselves from the influence of the very phenomenon they study. The modern global system of so-called nation states has become so much a part of our common sense view of the world that we cannot distance ourselves from its inexorable internal logic when we have the greatest need to do so.

All the more reason for historians of nationalism to take note of the stimulating collection of essays under review here edited by Michael G. Müller and Rolf Petri. At first glance theirs appears to be one more of many such collections which examine the construction of national identities in Central Europe, collections produced by countless international academic conferences that are held on this subject these days. Most such collections contribute little new or of value to the field. This one, however, is different. Most of the authors here eschew the teleology that requires the analysis to produce the nation as its end result. Instead, the authors focus on regional histories that produced ambivalence about the nation. The people under discussion here appear to have embraced a national identity in situational terms at best. Despite the efforts of nationalists to deny ambivalence, these historians conclude that rejection of a nationalist form of identity was just as likely as the acceptance of it.

The essays examine the histories of linguistically mixed border regions over the past hundred and fifty years. Three of them analyze social and cultural relations in Posen or West Prussia; the other articles examine in turn Galicia, Alsace-Lorraine, Carinthia, and South Tyrol, while one compares South Tyrol to North Schleswig. Five of the essays focus on developments that took place before 1918, while three of them focus more fully on events in the mid-twentieth century. Most of the authors chose their subjects in order to understand, in particular, whether or how the dynamic of multi-lingualism in so-called border regions shaped the particular ways in which populations responded to processes of nationalization. This focus enables them to assess what local forms of social significance – if any – attached to language use in those border regions. The authors are interested in tracing the multiple meanings that became attached to the phenomenon of different language (or dialect) use over time, meanings that

did not necessarily contribute to a linear process of nationalization in an age of rising territorial nationalism.

The collection opens with three fascinating case studies on Posen and West Prussia in the nineteenth century. “The history of German-speaking populations in the East Central Europe,” write the editors, “is usually understood as [part of] German history. This practice presumes that the boundaries separating different language groups within a region assumed some meaning that shaped both perception and actions, not simply in the modern period, but also earlier. Accordingly, the competing nationalization processes can be seen as the outcome of an increasing politicization of existing cultural identities” (p. ix). As if any further proof were needed, this kind of focus on local forms of self-identification demonstrates the inherent problems of a “stage theory” of nationalist development (or “revival”) that assign to linguistic difference a kind of teleological importance that can only end with the formation of nations. Michael Müller’s essay on the identities of German speakers in Posen and West Prussia examines the historical self-understanding of German language communities before 1848, pointing to their historic sense of identification with Poland, rather than with the Empire or the German Confederation. In terms of educational, religious, or cultural orientation, these communities did not seek links with German-speaking societies in the Empire. Reminding us that German-speaking cities protested against the partition just as loudly as did the Polish nobility in the region, Müller asserts: “in sum, they clearly had not connected their German-ness to some kind of collective consciousness [*Wir-Bewusstsein*], which would have served to differentiate them from a Polish ‘Other’” (p. 3). His analysis investigates which forms of difference were in fact linked to German language use in the region. The dilemmas of the early 19th-century reform-minded Prussian State about whether and how to implement communal and other reforms in the Polish partition territories helped spur the rise of Polish nationalism. Müller’s brief discussion of the period after 1848 reminds us that well into the 1860s, in the face of increasing Polish nationalist activism, the Prussian State found it difficult to mobilize local German-speaking populations for nationalist ends. He concludes that, even after 1848, the conditions for internal national conflict were relatively unfavorable in these regions. “Through the mid-19th century the nationalization of these regions as border regions appears to have been a largely externally induced, and accordingly fragile process...” (p. 11).

Thomas Serrier’s fine essay examines the concept of German *Kulturarbeit*, which many nationalists in the Wilhelmine period believed could revive Posen’s “German qualities”. Their project presumed a cultural gap

between Germans and Poles who inhabited the borderlands (e. g. the idea of “*polnische Wirtschaft*”). Yet, the more nationalist activists involved themselves in such *Kulturarbeit*, the more difficult they found it to maintain their own myths of German superiority. For if Germans were indeed superior, then why was it that the Poles, with all their “inherent” and political disadvantages, were able to forge a strong and self-conscious national political unity, while such unity remained elusive to the German-speaking populations. In perhaps the most conventional of the essays here, Ralph Schattkowsky looks by stages at the various social institutions (associations, press, changing elites) through which Polish nationalists built a mass community in the province of West Prussia. Although Schattkowsky takes a more functional approach to the question, referring at one point to a “pre-[Polish] state phase” (p. 79), he too is attentive to points of cultural and historical overlap among linguistic communities that made it impossible to predict a specifically nationalist outcome by 1900.

Dietlind Hüchtker attempts to historicize the myths associated with Galicia. Her essay examines discourses that define the so-called backwardness of Galicia in terms of its poly-ethnicity, focusing on representations of religious and economic “irrationality” by which literary writers and social observers characterized *Shtetl* life. Hüchtker rejects interpretations which view this myth as either an exercise in nostalgia or a backward looking utopia, a counterpoint to the harsh realities of modern nationalist conflict (Polish vs. Ruthene) and anti-Semitism. Instead, she sees the discourse of backward poly-ethnicity as a highly modern one, which only gained relevance when ethnic differences came to be understood somehow as real, in a society – Habsburg Austria – where modernization was not linked to a territorial nation state. While this approach to understanding the myth of Galicia represents an interesting contribution, it nevertheless misses some important points. For example, while poly-ethnicity might have been linked to ideas of backwardness in the Galician context, it often became the very proof of a utopian modernity in neighboring Bukowina, a region that produced several important literary giants and was often linked in the contemporary imagination to Galicia.

In his article, Rolf Wörsdörfer scrutinizes the myth of the “Windisch” population in Carinthia and Styria after 1920. He demonstrates that the invention of this ethnic group helped to solve certain political problems in the region, by distinguishing between Slovene nationalists and those Slovene speakers who nonetheless preferred Austrian citizenship to Yugoslav. The strength of this essay lies in its ability to de-couple the question of ethnic identity from presumptions about language use. In this case, the

experts defined a group of people as an ethnic group based on their political behavior. Neither the needs of interwar Austrian society nor the pro-Austrian behavior of this population in the years after 1918, however, had actually created this group. There was a decades-old regional tradition of Slovene-speakers who aligned themselves politically with German-speakers against Slovene nationalists – a tradition that Wörsdörfer unfortunately ignores. Although the colloquial term “Windisch” meant something different before 1918, the *phenomenon* that Wörsdörfer describes certainly existed in Imperial Austria. The existence of this group had even been institutionalized both in a political party and in a newspaper that shared the name “Stajerc” (Styrian). The latter had been created under the tutelage of German nationalist Mayor Josef Ornig of Pettau/Ptuj in 1900.

The last three essays to be discussed invoke the term *Heimat* in part to discuss the ambivalent ways that regional activists either linked their sense of identity to larger nations, or demarcated boundaries against a nation. Günter Riederer examines attempts to forge a sense of identity in Alsace-Lorraine in the years 1870–1918. Interestingly, German authorities promoted regional identity in this case (rather than German national identity *per se*) as a means of weakening earlier links to France. They did this in part by promoting traditions specific to the region, such as Church festivals and traditional peasant garb (*Tracht*). Riederer demonstrates that, despite competing attempts by German authorities or French nationalists to give specific content to these traditions, neither succeeded in lending these traditions an unquestioned national significance. Rather, they served equally well as nationalist symbols both to pro-German and pro-French activists. Rolf Petri’s essay comparing activists in North Schleswig and the South Tyrol offers one of the best analyses of *Heimat* and its uses that I have yet seen. After a comparative consideration of the historical roles that language, religion and political mobilization played in the process of nationalization in these two regions, Petri comes to question of *Heimat* discourses. “Was *Heimat*,” he asks, “from the point of view of the Nation on the frontier, a factor that encouraged or interfered with nationalization?” (161). In one sense, *Heimat*’s ability to awaken emotions in an individual can be read as a measure of how far nationalization has progressed in a given context. Yet, Petri notes, there are severe limits to the ability of the *Heimat* discourse to encourage nationalization. If an overbearing nation state makes demands that threaten the very ability of a region to maintain its own identity, *Heimat* can turn against concepts of the nation. In both northern and southern cases, for example, some cultural mixing, or at least the presence of the

'Other', is viewed as a necessary quality peculiar to the *Heimat* in border regions.

A powerful nation-state like Nazi Germany, however, threatened to destroy these very qualities by redrawing borders and moving populations. The fate of German-speaking South Tyroleans also demonstrates these limits only too clearly. Given the harsh choice or "Option" to abandon their *Heimat* and settle inside the German Reich or face an uncertain future in Fascist Italy, a majority initially voted for emigration and re-settlement. Yet, most were actually reluctant to leave and eventually preferred to stay, as support for the "Option" soon declined; in this sense, South Tyroleans ultimately chose *Heimat* over Nation. Only after 1945, when they found themselves again a minority in Denmark or Italy, could these German-speaking communities safely revive the unifying link between *Heimat* or region and nation. Although I disagree with some of Petri's depictions of nationalist movements in Habsburg Austria, I found this an extremely useful essay on several levels, one that really advances the field of nationalism studies considerably. In the final essay, Hans Heiss delivers a beautifully reflective consideration of the powers and limits of regionalism, based on the post-1945 history of the South Tyrol. Not surprisingly, Heiss' observations are delivered in a framework that pays close attention to telling local detail while placing its subject in a broadly comparative context.

There is one theoretical problem that, with the exception of Hüchtker, pertains to the pieces in this otherwise excellent collection. Do they really believe that the term "ethnicity" means something specific with regard to the frontier regions they examined? Or, as I suspect, is their use of this term functionally synonymous with the term "language-use"? I raise this troubling question because the use of the modern term "ethnicity" tends to imply that neighboring populations differed from each other in cultural terms far more than the evidence warrants. Furthermore, as Jeremy King and others have pointed out, the term ethnicity too often stands for the term "nation" when we discuss a pre-national period. Using the term "ethnicity" can reinforce the popular belief that national differences truly are somehow pre-ordained and insurmountable, and they can be read retrospectively onto earlier populations as "ethnic differences". But what do those differences amount to in fact? These authors dispel the notion that even linguistic differences can serve as predictors of national outcome, so I offer this plea that they consider using the term "ethnicity" only when it in fact conveys something greater than simple linguistic difference.

Pieter M. Judson

Nikola Langreiter/Margareth Lanzinger (Hg.), *Kontinuität: Wandel. Kulturwissenschaftliche Versuche über ein schwieriges Verhältnis*

(*kultur.wissenschaften* 5), Wien: Turia und Kant 2002, 245 Seiten

Kontinuität und Wandel: Zeichnet die zwei Begriffe im Titel des hier zu besprechenden Bandes wirklich ein schwieriges Verhältnis aus? Sind sie ein Oppositionspaar oder gar Gegenbegriffe? Waren sie nicht vielmehr ein einstmals notwendiges „Frageopfer“ zur wissenschaftshistorischen und wissenschaftstheoretischen Erkenntniserweiterung, das – weil überwunden – längst Einzug in die allgemeinen Einführungen in das Fach Volkskunde gehalten hat? Fragen über Fragen? Die Frage nach dem „schwierigen Verhältnis“ wird innerhalb eines fachlich umrissenen Rahmens gestellt, der sich ganz allgemein mit „Kulturwissenschaften“ umschreibt, aber betonterweise die Volkskunde, die Geschichtswissenschaft und die Cultural Studies behandelt, damit aber zugleich Vieles, was mittlerweile unter Kulturwissenschaften subsumiert wird, ausschließt. An dieser Stelle beginnen nun die ersten epistemischen Unzulänglichkeiten. Der wissenschaftshistorische Abriss zur Volkskunde (S. 15–17) weist einige gängige Namen des Faches auf, vergisst aber wichtige richtungweisende Referenzsysteme zu diesem Thema zu nennen. Da wären beispielsweise Hans Trümper mit seinem schlanken Band zum Thema „Kontinuität in den Geisteswissenschaften“ (1973)¹ oder Günther Wiegmann, Matthias Zender, Gerhard Heilfurth (1977) mit einer der ersten klugen Einführungen in das Fach²; ebenso nicht berücksichtigt ist die folgenreiche Festschrift für Hans Moser mit dem eindeutigen Titel „Kontinuität? Geschichtlichkeit und Dauer als volkscundliches Problem“ herausgegeben von Hermann Bausinger und Wolfgang Brückner (von 1969).³ Ohne diese Arbeiten wäre die Volkskunde nicht dort angekommen, wo sie jetzt ist und ohne diese Überlegungen wäre das Thema nicht überwunden in dem Sinne, dass es unbefragt, aber doch immer kritisch mitgedacht wird. Die Tatsache, dass solche Meilensteine der Disziplin übergangen werden, muss von den Autorinnen, Nikola Langreiter und Margareth Lanzinger entweder

1 Hans TRÜMPER (Hg.), *Kontinuität, Diskontinuität in den Geisteswissenschaften*, Darmstadt 1973.

2 Günther WIEGMANN/Matthias ZENDER/Gerhard HEILFURTH, *Volkskunde. Eine Einführung* (Grundlagen der Germanistik 12), Berlin 1977.

3 Hermann BAUSINGER/Wolfgang BRÜCKNER (Hg.), *Kontinuität? Geschichtlichkeit und Dauer als volkscundliches Problem*, Berlin 1969.