

Paweł Drymajło

REVIEW OF JAN JAKUB STOCK MEMOIRS: NOTATNIK Z TWIERDZY PRZEMYŚL [‘A DIARY FROM PRZEMYŚL FORTRESS 1914–1915’], COMPILED BY JANUSZ BATOR. – PRZEMYŚL, 2014. – 172 p.

The book I am going to review was created in very interesting circumstances. The graduate of University of Mining and Metallurgy (today: The University of Science and Technology) in Krakow, Janusz Bator, who found original notes of Jan Jakub Stock, decided to pay tribute to the former professor of his university by issuing them in the form of a book which comprised an introduction, references and additional study. This indicates an uncommon and outstanding attitude. 500 copies of the book were issued by ZUP MONTEL-BR s.c. Przemyśl.

Jan Jakub Stock lived in the years 1881–1925. He was connected with the cities of Przemyśl (it’s there he attended Gymnasium school), Lviv and Krakow. He studied at the Faculty of Philosophy of The Lviv University. His interests revolved around physics; in 1905 he became an assistant of professor Marian Smoluchowski in the Institute of Physics. Before the outbreak of World War I Stock was connected with the university as a so called docent, and having finished his habilitation thesis, he was preparing to obtaining *veniamlegendi*. He was one of the organizers of University of Mining and Metallurgy in Krakow but the plans of its inauguration were blighted by the international conflict. Then Jan Jakub Stock was exactly incorporated into the Austro-Hungarian army and was sent to do military service in the Przemyśl Fortress. During the whirlwind of war he made notes in which he described almost every single day of his life. After the war he became a lecturer at University of Mining and Metallurgy.

The book compiled by Janusz Bator comes under the same title as the original notes of Stock. The construction of the book is correct. It was divided into a few parts: an introduction, a descriptive part referring to the way the author of the compilation came into possession of Stock’s notes, a short biographical note about the journal author and, most importantly, his actual memoirs. What is described afterwards includes the family bonds of Jan Jakub Stock, a list of refugees his friend Józef Giebułtowicz looked after, Stock’s most important scientific pieces of work as well as the teaching staff of University of Mining and Metallurgy in the academic year 1919/1920. The book is concluded with a list of sources used and a set of photographs. In the introduction Bator presents shortly the history of Przemyśl starting from the early modern period up to year 1918, including a thorough description of the Fortress (even particular divisions into defensive units and the Fortress Command members were mentioned) – which is definitely an advantage of the book, as it gives a complete introduction to the history of the city and its most important military object. The introduction is followed by a part entitled: ‘After 100 years he returned to Przemyśl’

in which Bator gives an interesting description of the circumstances in which he came into possession of the original script by J. J. Stock. He informs the reader about the changes he made in the text (e.g. division into paragraphs or explanation of the abbreviations used) and about the purpose of issuing the manuscript after years. The original notes comprised two notebooks of around 180 pages, with dimensions 17x20 cm, filled with tiny calligraphy. Record was kept of nearly each day from 19th August 1914 to 25th March 1915.

I have divided my review into two parts. Firstly, I analysed the excerpts written by J. Bator and then Stock's notes. As I mentioned before, Bator gives the reader the benefit of being introduced to the history of Przemyśl – the city itself as well as the Fortress. Unfortunately, the following elements reveal numerous inconsistencies in handling the topic and errors in the research approach. Before pointing them out, I would like to highlight the fact that Janusz Bator's book is not a scientific study. As the author mentioned himself, he is not a historian and his book has a rather documentary-ancillary form. What indicates it is the writing style Bator uses, e.g. on p.9 he wrote: 'I had to buy this manuscript!'. On p.10 the author emphasises what changes he made in Stock's notes in order to make them clearer for the reader. Here the first inconsistency can be seen, which is writing one thing and doing another. Bator points out that he normalized the way of writing down dates. It would not be surprising, were it not for the fact that he himself writes dates in a few different ways. Examples can be seen on p.14, where the transcript says: 'In the years 1911–1914' and then 'in the years 1912/13'. On the other hand on page 15 we can read: '28.03.1915' and two lines below 'March 22nd1915'. This inconsistency, of course, can be seen in the parts of the book written by Bator. The biggest inaccuracies can definitely be noticed in the footnote references. Generally footnote numbers are written in Arial font, and the main body in Times New Roman. Sometimes the author 'sticks' digits to the text (e.g. in the ref.no. 11 on p.5 – 'p.34'), and sometimes he makes a space (ref.no. 16, p.7 – 'military mail no. 120'). It happens that Bator starts a footnote with a capital letter (ref.no. 17, p.7) and then starts the following one with a small letter (ref.no. 18, p.8). It depends on what can be found in the note, whether it is a name and a title or an author's comment (e.g. an explanation of an issue). It is not a great technical or editorial error but, in my opinion, a normalized notation in capital letters would give the text a more aesthetic look. What also offends the eye are minor errors of putting single letters in bold or using a different font. On p.15 the reader can notice that the sentence in the ref.no. 17 starts with the letter 'd' written in a different font (Arial) and in a different size. A similar error occurs on p.14 (ref. no. 25 written in the same inconsistent way).

As far as other remarks are concerned, what needs to be highlighted is the fact that Janusz Bator in his book refers to Internet websites in the footnotes, yet not providing the dates they were accessed. Similarly, he should not provide in the references (most often while explaining a person or place) Wikipedia, which, as an Internet source of information, has indeed its fans, however in the historian community is not considered as valuable. All the more so because he only mentions the name of the online encyclopaedia, and not a particular link. The last element which I would like to point out are explanations of the abbreviations the author used not in the references, but in Stock's text itself. Their aim is to clarify the reading and understanding of the text whereas, in my opinion, they only make it more difficult. On p.21 there is a note: 'Oblt. left for the sconces not having left any work' and neither in the text nor in the footnote is there an explanation that the abbreviation stands for a lieutenant rank in German (oberleutnant) which, for people not familiar with history

or military science in general, may be puzzling. But then the author found it important to explain the abbreviation 'r' (which in Polish stands for 'rok' – year), which is commonly known, making an ugly reference note with a bracket in the middle of the text. It can be found e.g. on p. 22 – „(...) 42 r(*oku* – *JB*)życia...” ('(...) at the age of 42'). While reading the book, some more minor errors can be noticed, but as they do not influence the content significantly, there is no point in mentioning them. Highlighting by the author that the book is not a scientific piece of work unfortunately does not exempt him from the necessity of keeping up the aesthetic standards as well as consistency in the notation. However, these are not errors that influence the unquestionably valuable content of the notes.

What must be added in defence of Janusz Bator is that the mere idea of issuing the manuscript is worthy of note. Professor Jan Jakub Stock is, without doubt, a person who deserves to have his notes published. Not everyone who would come into possession of his notes would be willing to devote their time and energy to issue them in a form of a book. Not only did Janusz Bator do it but he also made it more attractive by supplementing the text with a collection of photographs from the Great War period as well as contemporary ones – which perfectly complements Stock's notes. The listing of professor's scientific papers or his family relations may be of use for those closely interested in the author, which is also a big plus.

The notes themselves were divided into big chapters. The first one is 'Mobilization and the first days of the war'. It can be seen from the very beginning that the notes were written down by an educated man, oriented in the situation which was building up around him. The author knew the sides of the conflict, tried to describe them meticulously. Firstly he wrote about the commenced call-up, then the reader can find out, like from a war report, what lands were conquered by particular armies, how the troops were moving (also in the Western Front). Stock did not fight, he did uniform service at a registrar's office. He was a military servant, he evaluated crops and hay in the nearby villages (e.g. Grochowice, which is particularly mentioned). He also wrote about the Russian invasion in Lviv and the uncertainty people in his surroundings lived in. He pointed out that between 14th September 1914 and 30th June 1915 his family stayed in Vienna with their friends Giebułtowicz. From the text we can learn about his honesty, when he did not want to buy cattle at reduced prices in order to save some part of the money for himself. The journal also provides a set of very detailed information, like the fact of growing a beard by Stock. Anti-Semitism appears to be a very interesting plot of the story. On p. 57 the author wrote: '(...) during the war I saw so much Jewish villainy that in the future I will not be ashamed of my hatred towards the Jews'. He also wrote about ethnic problems in the besieged fortress – due to his nationality he was supposed to be treated worse. By far the most often Stock mentioned Hungarians, who very frequently robbed and mistreated civilians, and what is more had no fighting skills.

The second part of the notes is entitled 'Under siege again' and practically does not differ from the first one. The author wrote more about cannon thunders (which are mentioned nearly every day) but still his life revolved around the registrar's office he was working at. He was without doubt leading a comfortable life as for a soldier in a besieged fortress. We can read that he had breakfast, a three-course dinner, supper with meat and he also drank wine and tea. On 1st December the author witnessed a bombing, as he wrote on p. 92: 'A bomb thrown by a skilled hand fell in the backyard within the distance of 40 m from us and made a 2 m deep hole (...)'. From that time onwards bombings became more and more frequent, yet it was the author's only worry, which we can assume reading the words on

p.95: 'We are currently eating delicious sausages and brawns (...) Generally there is little work, a lot of food and one slowly turns into a bourgeois – a pig that thinks about nothing but food'. Thanks to Stock's notes the reader learns about professor's character. It is known he kept off alcohol, he tended to leave boozy evening meetings faster. Additionally, he did not like the Germans he worked with at the registrar's office. He complained that they were teasing him. He was also outraged by the officers' debauchery. He liked reading books and thinking a lot – he promised himself after war that he would focus more on reading. In this part the author also described how he was accused of espionage as well as the problem of lack of a Polish interpreter and the happy ending of the whole upheaval. The last pages of this chapter concern the preparation to yield the fortress. The last part of Stock's notes consists of only a few pages. It is entitled 'This is the end of the defence – what will happen to us?' The author focused on descriptions of Russians marching into Przemyśl and a good relationship between them and the inhabitants as well as the Austro-Hungarian army. Stock resigned from the uniform in order to avoid captivity. The journal ends in a moment when the author is unsure about tomorrow and does not know how to get hold of food.

Summing up, I would like to point out that the notes of Jan Jakub Stock comprise a journal from the period of the Great War, which will above all give the reader the view of a military servant's life in the early years of the war in Galicia. Battle descriptions or examples of poverty accompanying the conflict will not be found in the text. The notes were written quite monotonously and so probably looked Stock's life at that time. He did not complain about inconveniences, he slept 9 hours a day. He did not feel fear. Although Stock sometimes wrote about famine and poverty among people, and the fact that he was missing his family, he lived through the war more as an observer than its active participant. It is reflected in some excerpts where he jots down notes during the bombing and informs the reader that he is going to observe the raid. A large part of his notes Stock devoted to weather descriptions. He was not a soldier fighting at the front, he was just a servant in a uniform. This is why I believe his journal makes a good source for examining either official cases from World War I period or the besieged Przemyśl. And this gives a different view on the war than descriptions of tragic events, which are usually dominant in other sources.

Janusz Bator, in spite of significant lack of editorial skills, inconsistency in making footnote references, mixing different fonts or completely illogical explanations (or lack of explanations) of the abbreviations used, acquainted the reader with an interesting, so far unknown source and – as he wrote in the introduction – he paid due tribute to Jan Jakub Stock, one of the founders and organizers of today's University of Science and Technology in Krakow. It is only a pity that the manuscript compiler did not consult his meaningful and praiseworthy study with historians, who are professionally engaged in the issues of World War I. I have no doubt that the whole piece of work would have benefited from it and Janusz Bator would have avoided unnecessary mistakes which diminish the value of his work.