

nicht ganz korrekt sei. Nach Ansicht des Rezensenten hat Tuchtenhagen jedoch eher eine politisch-administrative, nicht eine national-sprachliche Schwedisierung gemeint² – und in diesem Sinne verwenden die Autoren diesen Begriff selbst (z.B. auf S. 324).

Alles in allem ist das hier anzuzeigende Buch durchaus als gelungen zu bewerten. Von seiner Qualität zeugt unter anderem die Tatsache, dass dem Rezensenten trotz aller Anstrengungen nur ein einziger Lapsus auffiel – der erste Rektor der Academia Gustavo-Carolina war der Theologieprofessor Olaus Moberg und nicht Sven Modig, wie es fälschlicherweise heißt (S. 312f.). Schließlich müssen auch die ausgezeichnete Übersetzung von Ivar Rütli und die ansehnliche Produktion des Verlags „Varrak“ hervorgehoben werden. Abschließend darf festgehalten werden, dass der aktuelle Stand der Geschichtswissenschaft hinsichtlich der schwedischen Zeit in Estland nun in mehreren allgemeinen Abhandlungen sachkundig zusammengefasst worden ist.

PÄRTEL PIIRIMÄE

SVETLANA BOGOJAVLENSKA: *Die jüdische Gesellschaft in Kurland und Riga 1795–1915* [The Jewish Community in Courland and Riga, 1795–1915]. Ferdinand Schöningh. Paderborn etc. 2012. 243 pp. ISBN 9783506771285.

Svetlana Bogojavlenska's monograph deals with Jewish communities in what would subsequently become the Republic of Latvia in 1918. Both Courland and Riga are somewhat atypical in the context of Jewry in the Russian Empire due to restrictions on the settlement of Jews. Nevertheless, a significant Jewish population lived in Courland before it became a Russian province in 1795, and the number of Jewish inhabitants of Riga increased rapidly in the 19th century. The sociocultural profile of the Courland Jewry differed from that of Poland or Belarus because of the lack of substantial co-territorial Slavic population. Riga as a large city had an increasingly cosmopolitan atmosphere and, as Bogojavlenska aptly demonstrates, the local Jewry was far from homogenous.

The author begins her discussion by referring in her Introduction to an opinion of Wolfgang Benz, a leading German researcher of anti-Semitism, who believes that anti-Semitism was something traditional and endemic to

² RALPH TUCHTENHAGEN: *Zentralstaat und Provinz im frühneuzeitlichen Nordosteuropa*, Wiesbaden 2008 (Veröffentlichungen des Nordost-Instituts, 5).

the Baltic region (as well as to Poland and Hungary).¹ Bogojavlenska reasonably states that such a view is too simplistic and stereotypical (pp. 13f). There were different kinds of anti-Jewish attitudes and one has to carefully look into the past in order to obtain a more nuanced picture.

To date, there are only few works on the history of Latvian Jews, and only two historians, Leo Dribins and Aivars Stranga, deal with more recent times and with anti-Semitism in Latvia.² Therefore, the objectives of Bogojavlenska's monograph are the following: to describe the specific legal status of Riga and Courland Jewry; to give an overview of its cultural and spiritual life and to describe its economic life and interaction with non-Jews. It is also important to specify in what spheres Jewish-Latvian (or Jewish-German, Jewish-Russian etc.) interaction took place, and to find out what kind of anti-Semitism or anti-Jewish attitudes were present in each particular case.

The book consists of an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion and some supplements, including a glossary of Jewish terms. The study's bibliography and the list of used primary sources are impressive. The author has familiarized herself with archival sources, as well as with periodicals in different languages (Russian, German, Latvian), whereas English literature is added in the bibliography. The first chapter describes the formation of legislation concerning the Jews in Courland, Riga and the so-called Baltic provinces in general. The next two chapters are the most informative ones because they are very rich in factual information. Whereas the first concerns the Jews of Courland, the other one is about the Jews of Riga.

It is quite logical and also reader-friendly that both chapters have nearly the same structure: we learn about the particular population dynamics of the Jews, their role in the local economy and occupational structure. Furthermore, the author discusses attempts of sociocultural (and linguistic) integration and the reactions of the authorities, the Germans, the Latvians and (in the case of Riga) the Russians. It is important to differentiate between these groups because of their different social and linguistic profile, status, power etc. The spiritual and cultural life of the Jewish community is described as well as the reactions to anti-Jewish attitudes and unsuccessful integration. Among these reactions the author discusses Zionism, emigration, educational efforts, socialism and, in the beginning of the 20th century, participation in local politics (especially concerning the Duma election campaigns).

It would lead too far afield to reproduce all the details in the book because these chapters are indeed very rich in information. It is shown that the attitudes of Latvians vary. Although Jews are often seen as competitors,

¹ WOLFGANG BENZ: Was ist Antisemitismus? München 2004, p. 209.

² See, e.g., LEO DRIBINS: Antisemitisms un tā izpausmes Latvijā. Vēstures atskats [Anti-Semitism and its Expressions in Latvia. A Historical Review], Riga 2001; AIVARS STRANGA: Ebreji un diktatūras Baltijā 1926–1940 [Jews and the Dictatorships in the Baltic States, 1926–1940], Riga 2002.

especially in terms of the growing urbanization of Latvians, religious anti-Semitism was not typical for Latvians. The Latvian *literati* did not have a uniform attitude towards Jews; in fact, in the 20th century, these became even more differentiated: while conservative circles saw Jews as revolutionaries and as a threat to the existing order, social-democrats did not share these feelings. Among the important outcomes of the research, it is particularly interesting that the interaction between Jews and others was largely dependent on economic status (p. 220). If Jews were large-scale merchants and controlled significant capital, they were likely to interact with Germans and Russians; if, on the other hand, they were more modest traders and craftsmen, they would interact with Latvians.

From my point of view, the main merit of this monograph is that it shows the heterogeneous character of the Courland and, particularly of the Riga Jewry. The tensions between different forms of Jewish identities and responses to unsuccessful integration (although it has to be said that on an individual level such integration was indeed possible) are clearly demonstrated. As elsewhere in Eastern Europe, the tensions were not only between traditionalists and secularists, but also between different chosen identities, meaning the adoption of either German or Russian characteristics.

One might have expected a reference by Bogojavlenska to the well-known book by Ezra Mendelsohn³ that, albeit dealing with the inter-war era, also refers to the past and emphasizes the differences in the structure, sociolinguistic profiles and identities of Jewish communities. Among the different versions of modernity, i.e. Zionism vs. socialism, one would also expect a discussion of Yiddishism, because it has to be emphasized that the latter was not identical to socialism or a leftist worldview, as is often believed. After all, independent Latvia after 1918 became a country with an impressive cultural autonomy and a strong system of Yiddish schools. This could not have happened out of the blue without any previous prerequisites.

This leads us to a more general problem. Of course, a historian is not a linguist (as is the reviewer) and some overgeneralizations such as the claim that Courland Jews spoke a version of Litvak Yiddish (“die litwakische Variante des Jiddischen”, p. 97) are understandable though it would be more precise to refer to it as a Courland variety of North-Eastern Yiddish dialects (especially if taking into account that the speakers of Courland Yiddish set clear boundaries between their variety and the rest of North-Eastern Yiddish). But of course, a historian working in the field of Jewish history in Eastern Europe would immensely gain from a certain working knowledge of Yiddish in order to be able to read the sources, having in mind especially the impressive Yiddish-language periodicals in Latvia. After all, even Zionists used Yiddish because it was the language most Jews grew up with, regardless of personal views on Jewish politics.

³ EZRA MENDELSON: The Jews of East Central Europe between the world wars, Bloomington 1983 (many reprints).

However, as a whole, the book is very informative and should be recommended to those who are interested in Jewish and Latvian history and the dynamics of local economic structures.

ANNA VERSCHIK

Carl Schirren als Gelehrter im Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft und politischer Publizistik. 13 Beiträge zum 22. Baltischen Seminar 2010 (Baltische Seminare, 20). Hrsg. von MICHAEL GARLEFF. Verlag Carl-Schirren-Gesellschaft. Lüneburg 2013. 256 S., Abb. ISBN 9783923149650; CARL SCHIRREN: *Vorlesungen über livländische Geschichte. Nachschrift von Johannes Lossius* (Baltische Seminare, 20-1). Hrsg. von CARL SCHIRREN und WILHELM LENZ. Verlag Carl-Schirren-Gesellschaft. Lüneburg 2013. 285 S. ISBN 9783923149728.

Es gibt viele Gründe, Persönlichkeit und Wirken des Dorpater Professors Carl Schirren (1826–1910) einer Neubewertung zu unterziehen. Viel zu sehr ist er aufgrund seiner Kampfschrift „Livländische Antwort an Herrn Juri Samarin“ (1869) zum Symbol der deutsch-russischen Auseinandersetzung in der „baltischen Frage“ geworden, als dass der Mensch dahinter, in den Himmel gehoben von den einen, verteufelt von den anderen, noch sichtbar wird. Es wäre sicher interessant, sich einmal näher mit dem akademischen Milieu in Dorpat in den 1860er Jahren auseinanderzusetzen, aus dem Schirren kam, oder mit einem biografischen Ansatz dessen Jugend- und Lehrjahre genauer unter die Lupe zu nehmen, um in ihm vielleicht einen für seine Generation prototypischen Gelehrten zu erkennen – oder auch nicht. Und warum nicht ein Doppelporrait der beiden Kontrahenten Schirren und Jurij Samarin (1819–1876) versuchen, zumal Letzterer nur sieben Jahre älter war? Oder sollten sich gar in der von der Forschung bislang vernachlässigten, über dreißig Jahre währenden Schaffenszeit Schirrens an der Kieler Universität (1874–1907) noch interessante Aspekte für ein Porrait des Ordinarius verbergen?

Allerdings ist auch zu Schirrens Kontroverse mit dem slavophilen Publizisten und Historiker Samarin noch nicht alles gesagt. Man könnte sich z.B. inspirieren lassen von der vor einigen Jahren von dem Tallinner Literaturwissenschaftler Jaan Undusk und dem Autor dieser Rezension geführten Diskussion über die Frage, inwieweit die durch Schirrens „Antwort“ symbolisierte Verteidigung der selbstverständlich deutsch geführten lokalen Autonomie eine Art Mehrwert auch für die Bevölkerungsmehrheit