

threat, is freedom within the limits humanity can achieve on earth. This is what is at stake. (192)

Communism does not evolve, but the communists do. They may have lost faith in their millenarian utopia, but they have sagely retained and masterfully wielded the dialectical tools of power that help them maintain their position at the top.

However, there is hope. The communists who strive for world domination are only human, and they commit errors and make miscalculations. If such miscalculations become widespread, if they slip out of the control of their communist controllers, the internal upheavals in the Soviet bloc might suddenly change from quantity to quality, argued Mackiewicz. Given favorable circumstances, they might even lead to the overthrow of communism (211). And so it came to pass: communism fell and the communists with it, if on golden parachutes.

A word of caution about the present edition: there are three translators, and in most cases they can be credited with providing a mellifluous reading experience. I encountered a few jarring phrases, such as “the Moor who has done his duty” (104), when it should be “the Negro did his job” (*Murzyn zrobił swoje*); “brotherly Polish Party” when “fraternal” is the standard communist-speak here (136); “those driven from their homeland” when “expellees” would do; or “state of emergency” when “martial law” fits better (210). There are also a few factual errors in Mackiewicz’s opus (there was an assassination attempt on Bierut (174); the number of deaths in Dresden is vastly exaggerated (207); the commanding officer of the 13th Lancers was Jerzy Dąmbrowski, not Dąbrowski (218); the Mass was in Latin, not in Polish in the author’s Wilno (221). The lack of an index is jarringly unprofessional. One hopes that Yale University Press will continue to bring out the numerous other books by this pugnacious reactionary liberal. ♦



The village of Drujsk (near Wilno, now in Belarus) in Mackiewicz’s time. Louise A. Boyd, *Polish Countrysides* (New York, 1937).

The Polish language in Canada

Język polonijny w Kanadzie. By Joanna Lustanski. Toronto: The Canadian Polish Research Institute, 2009. 295 pages. Bibliography, index of Canadian-Polish terms. ISBN: 0-920517-16-1. Paper In Polish.

Katarzyna Dziwirek

Joanna Lustanski’s book adds to the relatively small field of scholarship documenting the speech of Poles living abroad. The author does so for Canadian Polish and argues that varieties such as the one she describes should be considered dialects rather than deviations from the standard.

Lustanski starts with terminology. She presents the debate surrounding the term *Polonia*, which since the 1920s has come to mean roughly “Poles residing abroad.” There is much discussion as to who exactly belongs to *Polonia*. There are two general positions: the exclusive view, according to which to be a member of *Polonia* one must be born in Poland or be a child of Polish immigrants, speak Polish, and feel loyalty to Poland. The inclusive sense of *Polonia*, which the author adopts, is less closely tied to ethnicity. For Lustanski *Polonia* means a group of people who regardless of country of birth and degree of proficiency in Polish maintains Polish traditions, has ties to Poland, and exhibits an interest in Polish culture and an understanding of Polish national interests. The author takes a similarly broad approach to the definition of bilingualism, treating it as a relative rather than absolute term.

Chapter 2 presents a brief history of Polish immigration to Canada and an overview of Polish-Canadian life. For those familiar with Kościuszko and Pułaski it might come as a surprise that there were Poles fighting on the other side in the American Revolutionary War. The first significant group of Polish settlers in Canada were in fact British loyalists who were granted land in Canada after the war. Otherwise, the waves of immigration to Canada mirrored those to the United States with mostly rural migrants arriving between 1860 and 1939 and settling in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, while many of those who came after 1939 settled in the urban areas of Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver, and Edmonton. Modern-day Polish Canadians are not very involved in Polish-Canadian organizations (only about 5 percent participate), though there are about eighty Polish parishes and Polish is taught at twelve Canadian

universities, seven of which are in Ontario (data from 1994).

Chapter 3 offers a sociolinguistic characterization of the participants in the author's 2003 study, the source of most of the data used in the book. The study took place in Ontario and included two populations: first-generation Canadians who attended middle and high Saturday Polish schools in Mississauga, ON (221 participants) and Polish immigrants in Toronto (33 participants). The first generation of respondents attended regular Canadian schools since kindergarten, while the immigrants were educated in Poland and arrived in Canada as adults in the 1990s. The study consisted of questionnaires, tests, and interviews. Ninety-eight percent of all participants considered themselves bilingual, 94 percent of the immigrants and 83 percent of the children said that they used Polish every day. Ninety-four percent of the immigrants and 80 percent of first-generation participants responded "yes" to the question "Do you consider yourself a Pole?" and 95 percent of both groups frequently visited Poland. Immigrants sought contact with other Poles more often than first-generation Canadians and cited "shared Polish mentality" as the main reason. On the other hand, 46 percent of first-generation respondents belonged to Polish Canadian organizations (dancing or singing groups, scouts, and so on), while only four out of the 33 immigrants surveyed participated in Polish Canadian life (Polish church and other religious organizations).

Chapter 4 describes in great detail the Polish language used by the study participants. In phonetics and phonology, the speech of immigrants does not differ greatly from standard Polish, while the speech of first-generation respondents is much influenced by English. Thus *p*, *t*, *k* are pronounced, as in English, with aspiration in syllable onsets (also in the speech of immigrants), the vowel inventory is different, *c* is rendered as *ts*, the Polish phoneme *x* has much less aspiration than in standard Polish, *ś*, *ź*, *ć*, *dź* merge with *š*, *ž*, *č*, and *dž* (thus *proszę* and *prosię*, *czy* and *ci*, and so on, are pronounced identically), *r* is not a trill but a flap, cluster simplifications are very common (e.g. [spulnego] for *wspólnego*, [ścawa] for *chciała*), and gemminates are reduced (e.g. [ina] for *inna*).

Turning to inflectional morphology, the use of cases is in decline as compared to standard Polish, especially dative, locative and male-personal (MP) plural; first- and third-person present tense verbs are often conflated (e.g. *pilnuje* for both *pilnuję* and *pilnuje*), there are problems with tense and aspect and with reflexive

morphology: in general the author found reduction in the use of reflexive clitics, but also introduction of those clitics where they are not found in standard Polish (e.g. *zaparkować się* 'to park').

First-generation speakers assign nouns to different genders than Polish speakers in Poland: M>F (*karnisz* > *karnisza*), F>M (*kariera* > *karier*), N>F (*ta liceum*), M>N (*fortepian* > *fortepiano*), N>M (*ramię* > *ramień*). In the plural, there is much confusion and a tendency toward elimination of the MP category (*moje dziadki*, *słynne śpiewaki*), though the MP accusative pronoun seems to be spreading (*widzę konie* - *widzę ich*). Verbs are assigned into different conjugation classes (*umią*, *lubieli*, *gwizdają*), analogy influences some verbal forms (*bierzę*, *wyjmęłam*), and MP plural verb forms are inconsistently used (*one mieli*, *chłopcy są wysokie*).

The author analyzes the use of cases in great detail. There are some clear trends: simplifying declensional paradigms, using easier forms instead of harder ones (e.g. *Janek jest głupi* instead of *Janek jest głupcem*), shorter instead of longer ones (*szefu* instead of *szefowi*), but also much confusion/instability. While in standard Polish genitive singular of masculine nouns has two endings, *-a* and *-u*, in Canadian Polish *-a* is predominant (*koniaka*, *termometra*, *pomyśla*), though unexpected *-u* forms can be found as well (*cieniu*, *sierpniu*), probably due to the tendency to use familiar forms and thus increase syncretism (the *-u* forms are the correct forms in the locative case). In the dative, the *-owi* ending is losing to *-u* (*gościu*, *szefu*, *kraju*), but the author has also found *kotowi* (standard Polish *kotu*). In the locative, *-u* is gaining ground (*na roweru*).

Lustanski turns next to the lexicon and identifies nine different types of lexical interferences and innovations which she discusses at length and with ample examples. Some of the key types are adapted borrowings (*rentowanie*, *dwu-bedrumowy*, *superwajzorka*, *tajpować*), calques (*maszyna do prania*, *brać zdjęcie*, *zgubić wagę*), semantic modifications (*afery* in the sense of 'affair', standard Polish *romansy*). There are also words that combine Polish roots and affixes in ways not found in standard Polish (e.g. *wąsiarz*, *plotkowiec*, *smutnik*, *bagażnia*, *teściowy*, *polszczyzna*). The book contains an index of Canadian Polish terms.

In syntax, the most common characteristics of Canadian Polish are a) loss of instrumental with predicative nouns (*Kasia jest ładna dziewczyna*), b) changes in verbal government (*pomagać z pracą*), c) lack of genitive of negation (*Nie ma w wierszu duch epoki*, *Nie mogła otworzyć oczu*), d) increase in the use

of the infinitive (*kontynuować pisać, prosił mnie pójść*), e) changes in prepositions (*na internecie/radiu/telefonie, używany dla*), f) use of prepositions where none are used in standard Polish (*kontynuować z programem*), g) use of first- and second-person subject pronouns, h) use of classifying adjectives before nouns (*leśne grzyby, studencka organizacja*), and i) changes in numeral syntax.

The author concludes that Polish spoken by Polish Canadians maintains genetic features of standard Polish, but also contains much interference from English and, because it has evolved independently from standard Polish, many innovations (the author claims that it also exhibits archaisms but this claim is less convincing). The language of immigrants is closer to standard Polish than the language of first-generation Canadians due to their higher language consciousness, i.e., linguistic intuition (knowing what sounds right). The Polish of first-generation speakers is characterized by defective knowledge of language norms and considerably lower language consciousness.

Can we really consider Canadian Polish to be a dialect of Polish? I am not convinced we can, precisely because the first-generation speakers do not have a high level of language consciousness. Furthermore, my students who are not ethnically Polish make the very same mistakes in morphology and syntax, and thus I am inclined to see these as mistakes/interferences rather than innovations. Also, the book does not always make clear how systematic the deviations from standard Polish are. Despite this disagreement, I found the study well designed and the book well written and very informative. It should be of much interest to linguists, Polish teachers, and immigration scholars. ♦

Silent Intelligentsia A Study of Civilizational Oppression

Edited by Jan Kieniewicz. Warsaw: Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies “Artes Liberales,” University of Warsaw, 2009. 208 pages. ISBN 978-83-920349-9-5.

Patricia A. Gajda

Jan Kieniewicz, the editor and contributor to this volume, and a stellar team of his fellow scholars from Polish, French, and Russian universities and academies of science and the American Council of

Learned Societies take part in a fascinating, complex interdisciplinary project. They observed that, despite our knowledge about expansion of European empires in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, researchers had, up to the early years of this decade, not attempted to apply the paradigm of colonialism to those central and eastern European areas into which Russia and Germany had expanded. Instead, they applied it only to far-flung, non-European areas of the globe. What effect did the colonial power and its educational system have on these subjugated peoples? Did they suffer civilizational oppression from an alien Other that challenged their culture and value system? Kieniewicz and his colleagues set out to answer these and many other questions.

They assumed the existence of spontaneously formed intelligentsias (Polish and others), each with a self-appointed mission to identify and articulate the national identity and to speak to the foreign colonial authorities on behalf of their own people, victims of political aggression, in order to lead them in the modernization and transformation of their society. Thus emerged the present project, “Silent Intelligentsia. A Study of Civilizational Oppression” in 2004–2005 out of debates during a seminar at the Center for Studies on the Classical Tradition in Poland and East Central Europe at the University of Warsaw. During the following three years, the contributors individually sought to answer questions or test hypotheses on numerous facets of the larger project. They returned to a follow-up conference in 2007 with some answers as well as some new questions. The present volume reports on their experiences and conclusions.

Contributors, themselves active researchers in postcolonial studies in non-European areas of the world, apply their expertise in the present volume to throw light on the central and eastern European, particularly the Polish, experience. For example, they wanted to know how the intelligentsia’s mission was affected when the only education open to them was delivered in the foreign language and literary tradition of the occupier, as it had been in the Russian-controlled Kingdom of Poland in the nineteenth century. Was this analogous to the Indian experience under the Raj? Of all the fragments that had once made up the lands of the *Rzeczpospolita*, it was here that the intelligentsia had the greatest opportunity to define the Polish national identity and contribute to the modernization of its society. Their analysis is not entirely confined to the Polish lands of the Russian partition. Brief but informative descriptions are given of the political