detailed work directly on the guild records, is not included, so reinforcing the point made above that the representativeness of her quantitative tables is very unclear.

Urban historians of Britain and the Low Countries may also wonder about her argument, in both books, that their economic growth was because their states were first to weaken guilds' power and substitute 'generalized' forms of support for trade and industry. In England's case, remembering national policies such as the exclusion of the Jews from 1290 until 1653 (Ogilvie accuses guilds of being anti-Semitic), the statutory provision for seven-year apprenticeships (Ogilvie regards long apprenticeships as pointless from a training perspective and largely a device by guild masters to reduce access and extort extra work) and the manipulation by the crown of monopolies and patents (which Ogilvie presents as a superior means to support innovation than guild regulation), none of them the product of guild lobbying (indeed often the opposite), one wonders whether the nation-state was necessarily more socio-economically progressive than guilds, especially before a parliament disproportionately made up of urban representatives began to control state policy after 1688. Nor is it clear, at least before 1750, that economic growth was driven by towns that had escaped guild involvement: the growth of London, Bristol, Norwich, Exeter, York and Newcastle appears to suggest otherwise. One might argue that such growth took place *despite* the strong guild presences in these places, but this would require an engagement with the specifics of urban history which is not on offer here. Ogilvie's two studies should certainly be compulsory reading for anyone interested in the topic, particularly for the range of challenging arguments which she deploys so systematically, but most urban historians may wish for a more 'particularized' account of the place of guilds (and indeed other forms of civil society) within urban society.

Jonathan Barry
University of Exeter

Curtis G. Murphy, *Citizens into Subjects. City, State and the Enlightenment in Poland, Ukraine, and Belarus*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press, 2018. 320pp. $28.95 pbk.
doi:10.1017/S0963926819000737

The author presents the story of the former Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth's cities in the nineteenth century as one of decline and loss. The factors responsible for this development were not wars or less favourable social, economic or cultural conditions compared to western and central Europe, but enlightened politics of rational statehood and centralism. They stifled civic activity and urban economies, made the cities rather wilt along in comparison with their western counterparts, and turned citizens into subjects. Rulers saw only 'disorder, chaos, and inefficiency' where actually there had been pluralism, complex balancing of interests and conditions for flourishing economies; they did not understand the objects of their policies, forced order and reforms upon the cities which were alien to their social and cultural conditions, and finally proved to them be dysfunctional.

Only one of the six chapters of Murphy's book deals with the period before the eighteenth century and tries to make the point that cities in the Polish–Lithuanian

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963926819000737 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Commonwealth had similar starting conditions like cities in pre-modern central and western Europe. Based on the 'Magdeburg Law', these cities developed 'civic spaces', and urbanites frequently referred to the rights and freedoms granted by this framework in petitions and legal documents. These references even seem to have increased during the eighteenth century when first the Polish crown and then the partition powers tried to bring the cities under more centralized control. They displayed ideas of 'civic identity', 'urban republicanism', 'citizenship' and the concept of the city as a community set apart from the countryside and separated by traditional rights from higher powers. Murphy provides the reader with abundant examples for this language and invokes Quentin Skinner to strengthen his point that these representations give us insights into the self-perception and identity of citizens in the former Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth which survived well into the nineteenth century.

It is not completely clear whether Skinner would agree. After all, he reminds us that we need to put texts into their discursive context and to think rather about their performative function than about what they literally say. It might not be too surprising that urban representatives referred to traditional rights and freedoms when cities increasingly came under pressure from states and their enlightened reformers. But what does this tell us about how they saw themselves and constructed the urban community? If there is one recurring theme in Murphy's analysis, then it is the emphasis certain urban groups put on *particular* rights and privileges. Once again, this is not too surprising because that was very much what was in place and economically highly significant, especially for the Jewish communities. The author convincingly shows that the enlightened drive for equality as a matter of fact disadvantaged the Jews, especially in the Russian part of the former Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth. The Christian–Jewish divide which is so typical for many of the cities in this region is not the main topic of this book, however, which focuses rather on the relation between centralizing state power and cities. However, it is, of course, important when we talk about citizenship and civic identity. Murphy suggests that the relationship in practice was much better than historians thought; that there was co-operation when it came to the defence of the city's rights, and that even Christian–Jewish conflicts often demonstrated a common regard for law and urban institutions. The significance of the fact that Jews and Christians often made use of concepts like the common good and the city as frame of reference, however, should not be overestimated. Did Christians include Jews in their idea of urban citizenship? Did Jews identify themselves as an integral part of a community together with their Christian neighbours? If the answer to both questions is negative (and with reference to the existing literature I think it is), then the implicit equation of the pre-modern Polish–Lithuanian city with its western counterparts seems to be less plausible than the author suggests, not to speak of his concept of citizenship. Centralization might have done the cities of the former Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth no good, but there were other reasons why they became backwaters in the nineteenth century, the conditions for Jews in the Russian pale of settlement being one of them.

Murphy's book is an example of passionate revisionism. He wants to 'de-orientalize' the picture historians have given of the urban world of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth and put it back where it belongs according to the author: in the heart of Europe. As is often the case with revisionist projects, valid points seem to be overstated and opponents painted in darker colours than they

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963926819000737 Published online by Cambridge University Press

deserve. Most historians working on east central and eastern European cities and urban communities are far from orientalizing their subject, but rather aim to carve out differences and alternative functionalities of cities in the eastern European imperial peripheries. However, Murphy's fascinating and refreshing study opens new perspectives and may trigger a debate on the topic.

Felix Schnell
University of Essex

Clemens Wischermann, Aline Steinbrecher and Philip Howell (eds.), *Animal History in the Modern City: Exploring Liminality*. London: Bloomsbury, 2019. xi + 245pp. 26 figures. 4 tables. Index. £85 hbk. £73.44 eBook. £73.44 ePDF.
doi:10.1017/S0963926819000749

The drought has turned to a flood. Where little was thought or written about animals in urban history before the turn of the millennium, now we have a rush of edited collections and companion volumes about the juxtaposition of species in cities ancient and modern. There were at least five published in 2018, with several more to come in 2019, including the volume under review. As inevitably happens, particularly with conference proceedings, some of these collections are uneven in style and lacking in clear purpose, but not so *Animal History in the Modern City*. This important new book sets out to explore the liminality of animals in urban history and the editors' introduction provides a strong conceptual basis for achieving this objective.

In the literature, there are many interpretations of the liminal. The starting point in this book is the theoretical platform established in the twentieth century by anthropologists such as Arnold van Gennep, Victor Turner and more recently Bjørn Thomassen. This is developed in the introduction through a subtle and nuanced development of a number of strands that are capable of testing empirically. If challenged, I would probably have said that liminality is about the in-between spaces where animals can survive and sometimes even prosper in human environments. But I was persuaded by this book that the idea can be opened out much further into ways of representing and understanding urban modernity. We are told that it is a mistake to identify the liminal with the marginal; rather, liminality is at the core of the modern project. While liminality can be seen as another way of thinking through the hybridity of actor networks or assemblages of objects, the authors want us to go further and pay attention to the co-production of species and the social differentiation that follows, arguing that the mechanisms of domination, oppression and exploitation lead to transformations that have commonalities for underprivileged humans *and* animals.

The theoretical superstructure of the introductory chapter is inspirational in many ways and helps the reader to imagine new conceptual coinages, such as hum-an-imals or limin-animals. The potential danger for ambitious editors is that their contributors may not want to deliver on such a prospectus. But there are a sufficient number of chapters in this collection that are fully on message to carry the argument through from beginning to end. As Wischermann and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963926819000737 Published online by Cambridge University Press