

General Editor: Andreas Umland,
Stockholm Centre for Eastern European Studies, andreas.umland@ui.se

Commissioning Editor: Max Jakob Horstmann,
London, mjh@ibidem.eu

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE*DOMESTIC & COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Prof. **Ellen Bos**, *Andrássy University of Budapest*
Dr. **Gergana Dimova**, *University of Winchester*
Dr. **Andrey Kazantsev**, *MGIMO (U) MID RF, Moscow*
Prof. **Heiko Pleines**, *University of Bremen*
Prof. **Richard Sakwa**, *University of Kent at Canterbury*
Dr. **Sarah Whitmore**, *Oxford Brookes University*
Dr. **Harald Wydra**, *University of Cambridge*

SOCIETY, CLASS & ETHNICITY

Col. **David Glantz**, *"Journal of Slavic Military Studies"*
Dr. **Marlène Laruelle**, *George Washington University*
Dr. **Stephen Shulman**, *Southern Illinois University*
Prof. **Stefan Troebst**, *University of Leipzig*
POLITICAL ECONOMY & PUBLIC POLICY
Dr. **Andreas Goldthau**, *Central European University*
Dr. **Robert Kravchuk**, *University of North Carolina*
Dr. **David Lane**, *University of Cambridge*
Dr. **Carol Leonard**, *Higher School of Economics, Moscow*
Dr. **Maria Popova**, *McGill University, Montreal*

FOREIGN POLICY & INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Dr. **Peter Duncan**, *University College London*
Prof. **Andreas Heinemann-Grüder**, *University of Bonn*
Prof. **Gerhard Mangott**, *University of Innsbruck*
Dr. **Diana Schmidt-Pfister**, *University of Konstanz*
Dr. **Lisbeth Tarlow**, *Harvard University, Cambridge*
Dr. **Christian Wipperfürth**, *N-Ost Network, Berlin*
Dr. **William Zimmermann**, *University of Michigan*
HISTORY, CULTURE & THOUGHT
Dr. **Catherine Andreyev**, *University of Oxford*
Prof. **Mark Bassin**, *Södertörn University*
Prof. **Karsten Brüggemann**, *Tallinn University*
Dr. **Alexander Etkind**, *University of Cambridge*
Dr. **Gasan Gusejnov**, *Moscow State University*
Prof. **Leonid Luks**, *Catholic University of Eichstaett*
Dr. **Olga Malinova**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*
Dr. **Richard Mole**, *University College London*
Prof. **Andrei Rogatchevski**, *University of Tromsø*
Dr. **Mark Tauger**, *West Virginia University*

ADVISORY BOARD*

Prof. **Dominique Arel**, *University of Ottawa*
Prof. **Jörg Baberowski**, *Humboldt University of Berlin*
Prof. **Margarita Balmaceda**, *Seton Hall University*
Dr. **John Barber**, *University of Cambridge*
Prof. **Timm Beichelt**, *European University Viadrina*
Dr. **Katrin Boeckh**, *University of Munich*
Prof. em. **Archie Brown**, *University of Oxford*
Dr. **Vyacheslav Bryukhovetsky**, *Kyiv-Mohyla Academy*
Prof. **Timothy Colton**, *Harvard University, Cambridge*
Prof. **Paul D'Anieri**, *University of Florida*
Dr. **Heike Dörrenbächer**, *Friedrich Naumann Foundation*
Dr. **John Dunlop**, *Hoover Institution, Stanford, California*
Dr. **Sabine Fischer**, *SWP, Berlin*
Dr. **Geir Flikke**, *NUPI, Oslo*
Prof. **David Galbreath**, *University of Aberdeen*
Prof. **Alexander Galkin**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*
Prof. **Frank Golczewski**, *University of Hamburg*
Dr. **Nikolas Gvosdev**, *Naval War College, Newport, RI*
Prof. **Mark von Hagen**, *Arizona State University*
Dr. **Guido Hausmann**, *University of Munich*
Prof. **Dale Herspring**, *Kansas State University*
Dr. **Stefani Hoffman**, *Hebrew University of Jerusalem*
Prof. **Mikhail Ilyin**, *MGIMO (U) MID RF, Moscow*
Prof. **Vladimir Kantor**, *Higher School of Economics*
Dr. **Ivan Katchanovski**, *University of Ottawa*
Prof. em. **Andrzej Korbonski**, *University of California*
Dr. **Iris Kempe**, *"Caucasus Analytical Digest"*
Prof. **Herbert Küpper**, *Institut für Ostrecht Regensburg*
Dr. **Rainer Lindner**, *CEEER, Berlin*
Dr. **Vladimir Malakhov**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*

Dr. **Luke March**, *University of Edinburgh*
Prof. **Michael McFaul**, *Stanford University, Palo Alto*
Prof. **Birgit Menzel**, *University of Mainz-Germersheim*
Prof. **Valery Mikhailenko**, *The Urals State University*
Prof. **Emil Pain**, *Higher School of Economics, Moscow*
Dr. **Oleg Podvintsev**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*
Prof. **Olga Popova**, *St. Petersburg State University*
Dr. **Alex Pravda**, *University of Oxford*
Dr. **Erik van Ree**, *University of Amsterdam*
Dr. **Joachim Rogall**, *Robert Bosch Foundation Stuttgart*
Prof. **Peter Rutland**, *Wesleyan University, Middletown*
Prof. **Marat Salikov**, *The Urals State Law Academy*
Dr. **Gwendolyn Sasse**, *University of Oxford*
Prof. **Jutta Scherrer**, *EHESS, Paris*
Prof. **Robert Service**, *University of Oxford*
Mr. **James Sherr**, *RIIA Chatham House London*
Dr. **Oxana Shevel**, *Tufts University, Medford*
Prof. **Eberhard Schneider**, *University of Siegen*
Prof. **Olexander Shnyrkov**, *Shevchenko University, Kyiv*
Prof. **Hans-Henning Schröder**, *SWP, Berlin*
Prof. **Yuri Shapoval**, *Ukrainian Academy of Sciences*
Prof. **Viktor Shnirelman**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*
Dr. **Lisa Sundstrom**, *University of British Columbia*
Dr. **Philip Walters**, *"Religion, State and Society", Oxford*
Prof. **Zenon Wasyliv**, *Ithaca College, New York State*
Dr. **Lucan Way**, *University of Toronto*
Dr. **Markus Wehner**, *"Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung"*
Dr. **Andrew Wilson**, *University College London*
Prof. **Jan Zielonka**, *University of Oxford*
Prof. **Andrei Zorin**, *University of Oxford*

* While the Editorial Committee and Advisory Board support the General Editor in the choice and improvement of manuscripts for publication, responsibility for remaining errors and misinterpretations in the series' volumes lies with the books' authors.

Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society (SPPS)

ISSN 1614-3515

Founded in 2004 and refereed since 2007, SPPS makes available affordable English-, German-, and Russian-language studies on the history of the countries of the former Soviet bloc from the late Tsarist period to today. It publishes between 5 and 20 volumes per year and focuses on issues in transitions to and from democracy such as economic crisis, identity formation, civil society development, and constitutional reform in CEE and the NIS. SPPS also aims to highlight so far understudied themes in East European studies such as right-wing radicalism, religious life, higher education, or human rights protection. The authors and titles of all previously published volumes are listed at the end of this book. For a full description of the series and reviews of its books, see www.ibidem-verlag.de/red/spps.

Editorial correspondence & manuscripts should be sent to: Dr. Andreas Umland, Department of Political Science, Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, vul. Voloska 8/5, UA-04070 Kyiv, UKRAINE; andreas.umland@cantab.net

Business correspondence & review copy requests should be sent to: *ibidem* Press, Leuschnerstr. 40, 30457 Hannover, Germany; tel.: +49 511 2622200; fax: +49 511 2622201; spps@ibidem.eu.

Authors, reviewers, referees, and editors for (as well as all other persons sympathetic to) SPPS are invited to join its networks at www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=52638198614
www.linkedin.com/groups?about=&gid=103012
www.xing.com/net/spps-ibidem-verlag/

Recent Volumes

- 226 *Daria Isachenko, Mykhailo Minakov, Gwendolyn Sasse (Eds.)*
Post-Soviet Secessionism
Nation-Building and State-Failure after Communism
ISBN 978-3-8382-1538-9
- 227 *Jakob Hauter (Ed.)*
Civil War? Interstate War? Hybrid War?
Dimensions and Interpretations of the Donbas Conflict in 2014–2020
With a foreword by Andrew Wilson
ISBN 978-3-8382-1383-5
- 228 *Tima T. Moldogaziev, Gene A. Brewer, J. Edward Kellough, (Eds.)*
Public Policy and Politics in Georgia
Lessons from Post-Soviet Transition
ISBN 978-3-8382-1535-8
- 229 *Oxana Schmies (Ed.)*
NATO's Enlargement and Russia
A Strategic Challenge in the Past and Future
With a foreword by Vladimir Kara-Murza
ISBN 978-3-8382-1478-8
- 230 *Christopher Ford*
UKAPISME—Une Gauche Perdue
Le marxisme anti-colonial dans la révolution ukrainienne 1917 - 1925
Avec une preface de Vincent Prémumey
ISBN 978-3-8382-0899-2
- 231 *Anna Kutkina*
Between Lenin and Bandera
Decommunization and Multivocality in Post-Euromaidan Ukraine
With a foreword by Juri Mykkänen
ISBN 978-3-8382-1506-8
- 232 *Lincoln E. Flake*
Defending the Faith
The Russian Orthodox Church and the Demise of Religious Pluralism
With a foreword by Peter Martland
ISBN 978-3-8382-1378-1
- 233 *Nikoloz Samkharadze*
Russia's Recognition of the Independence of Abkhazia and South Ossetia
Analysis of a Deviant Case in Moscow's Foreign Policy Behavior
With a foreword by Neil MacFarlane
ISBN 978-3-8382-1414-6
- 234 *Arve Hansen*
Urban Protest
A Spatial Perspective on Kyiv, Minsk, and Moscow
With a foreword by Julie Wilhelmssen
ISBN 978-3-8382-1495-5

Eleonora Narvselius, Julie Fedor (eds.)

**DIVERSITY IN THE EAST-CENTRAL
EUROPEAN BORDERLANDS**

Memories, Cityscapes, People

ibidem
Verlag

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISBN-13: 978-3-8382-1523-5

© *ibidem*-Verlag, Stuttgart 2021

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Dies gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und elektronische Speicherformen sowie die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the prior written permission of the publisher. Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

Printed in the EU

CONTENTS

List of Figures.....	7
Acknowledgments.....	11
<i>Eleonora Naroselius</i>	
Introduction. Remembering Diversity in East-Central European Cityscapes.....	13
<i>Bo Larsson</i>	
Urban Environment and Perished Populations in Chişinău, Chernivtsi, L'viv, and Wrocław. Historical Background and Memories Versus City Planning and Future Perspectives	41
<i>Natalia Otrishchenko</i>	
Between Anonymity and Attachment. Remembering Others in Lviv's Pidzamche District.....	95
<i>Juliet D. Golden and Hana Cervinkova</i>	
On the Peripheries of Memory. Tracing the History of the Old Jewish Cemetery in Wrocław's Urban Imaginary.....	127
<i>Gaëlle Fisher</i>	
Moving Forward through the Past. Bukovina's Rediscovery after 1989-91.....	147
<i>Anastasia Felcher</i>	
Thinking Differently, Acting Separately? Heritage Discourse and Heritage Treatment in Chişinău	183
<i>Paweł Czajkowski</i>	
Myths and Monuments in the Collective Consciousness and Social Practice of Wrocław	227
<i>Eleonora Naroselius</i>	
A Tragedy of the Galician Diversity. Commemoration of Polish Professors Killed in Lviv during World War II.....	263

<i>Alexandr Voronovici</i> A Tangle of Memory. The <i>Eternitate</i> Memorial Complex in Chişinău and History Politics in Moldova.....	297
<i>Barbara Pabjan</i> Patterns of Collective Memory Socio-Cultural Diversity in Wrocław Urban Memory.....	333
<i>Nadiia Bureiko and Teodor Lucian Moga</i> Identificational and Attitudinal Trends in the Ukrainian- Romanian Borderland of Bukovina	381
About the Editors and Contributors	407
Index.....	413

List of Figures

- Figure 2.1.** Chişinău. Background map from 1941, showing streets where inhabitants and property owners were registered in 1930 or 1940, according to archival material.
- Figure 2.2.** Chişinău. Property owners around Piaţa Veche (the Old Market) in 1930.
- Figure 2.3.** Chişinău. Buildings and property owners in 1940 along the central part of Strada Mihai Viteazu (present-day Strada Mihai Eminescu).
- Figure 2.4.** Chernivtsi. Streets where inhabitants or property owners in 1912, 1936, or 1940 are registered, based on archival material.
- Figure 2.5.** Chernivtsi. Buildings and property owners at Springbrunnengasse (interwar Strada Fântanei, present-day Vulytsya Petra Sahaydachnoho) and Synagogengasse (interwar Strada Wilson, later Vulytsya Henri Barbusse'a, now again Vulytsya Synahohy) in 1912 in the Lower Town.
- Figure 2.6.** Chernivtsi. Buildings, users, and inhabitants at Piaţa Unirii (Austrian Ringplatz, present-day Ploshcha Tsentral'na), Strada Bucureştilor (Austrian Postgasse, present-day Vulytsya Khudyakova), and the southern part of Strada Regele Ferdinand (Austrian Enzenberg Hauptstrasse, present-day Holovna vulytsya) in 1936 and earlier.
- Figure 2.7.** L'viv. Streets where property owners or business activities were registered in 1929 and in some cases earlier, based on archival material.
- Figure 2.8.** L'viv. Buildings and business activities in 1929 and earlier around Rynek (present Ploshcha Rynok).
- Figure 2.9.** L'viv. Buildings and business activities in 1929 along the middle part of Ulica Zamarstynowska (present Vulytsya Zamarstynivs'ka).
- Figure 2.10.** Wrocław. Streets where inhabitants and users in 1936 are registered, according to archival material.

- Figure 2.11.** Wrocław. Buildings and business activities in 1936 around Ringplatz (present Rynek).
- Figure 2.12.** Wrocław. Buildings and business activities in 1936 around Wallstraße (present-day ulica Pawła Włodkowska) and Antonienstraße (present-day ulica Świętego Antoniego).
- Figure 3.1.** Panoramic view of Pidzamcze from the High Castle (circa 1960s–80s).
- Figure 3.2.** People on the streets of Pidzamcze. Collage made of photos from Urban Media Archive, Center for Urban History of East Central Europe, Lviv.
- Figure 6.1.** Chişinău, former yeshiva Magen Dovid and former synagogue named after Yehuda Leib Tsirelson.
- Figure 6.2.** Chişinău, former pre-burial house Bait Tahara at the Jewish cemetery.
- Figure 6.3.** Memorial to the Victims of Chişinău Ghetto (1993).
- Figure 6.4.** Memorial to the Victims of Chişinău Pogrom of 1903 (1993/2003).
- Figure 6.5.** Memorial to the Victims of Fascism (1982/2015).
- Figure 6.6.** Manuc Bey Manor Museum Complex, Hînceşti; the palace before the works began (2013).
- Figure 6.7.** Manuc Bey Manor Museum Complex, Hînceşti; the palace during the works (2015).
- Figure 6.8.** Manuc Bey Manor Museum Complex, Hînceşti; the palace after completion of the restoration works (2015).
- Figure 7.1.** Plastic scale model of old Lwów in Wrocław.
- Figure 7.2.** How to commemorate the past of Wrocław?
- Figure 7.3.** Recognition of monuments among the inhabitants of Wrocław.
- Figure 7.4.** Lwów myth: beliefs about the Lwów origin of the Wrocław settlers.
- Figure 7.5.** What should be remembered from Wrocław's history?
- Figure 7.6.** Attitudes toward history of Wrocław.
- Figure 7.7.** Local identity between myth and history.

- Figure 8.1.** Monument to the Lwów professors in Wrocław. Sculptor Borys Michałowski.
- Figure 8.2.** The restored Soviet monument with a changed dedication that now reads: "To researchers from the Lviv Polytechnic Institute who fell during World War II".
- Figure 8.3.** The new monument on the Wuleckie Hills unveiled in 2011.
- Figure 9.1.** *Eternitate* memorial complex, view from the main entrance.
- Figure 9.2.** One of sculptures at the memorial complex, displaying different stages of the Soviet war effort.
- Figure 9.3.** Section celebrating the "compatriots" awarded the title "Hero of the Soviet Union" or the "Order of Glory," originating from the territories of the future Republic of Moldova.
- Figure 9.4.** Monument commemorating the Hungarian POWs who died in Soviet captivity on the territory of present-day Republic of Moldova in 1945–48 (erected in 2015).
- Figure 9.5.** Plaque reading: "An alley of Kazakh apple trees, planted by the General Consulate of the Republic of Kazakhstan in Chişinău with the support of civil organizations of the Republic of Moldova in the memory of those who died in the Great Patriotic War. 24.04.2015" (erected in 2015).
- Figure 9.6.** Section of the memorial complex dedicated to those "fallen" in the 1992 Transnistrian conflict (erected in 1998).
- Figure 10.1.** A model of three strategies for interpreting the city's past in its temporal and spatial dimensions.
- Figure 10.2.** Importance of the past for different age groups in Wrocław; a representative population sample, N=547.
- Figure 10.3.** Importance of the past in Wrocław.
- Figure 10.4.** The index of acceptance of a name change in Wrocław, differentiation by level of conservatism.

- Figure 10.5.** The criteria of the perception of historical urban space in Wrocław, differentiation by occupation.
- Figure 10.6.** The criteria of the perception of historical urban space in Wrocław, differentiation by educational attainment.
- Figure 10.7.** The criteria of the perception of historical urban space in Wrocław, differentiation by level of religious conservatism.
- Figure 10.8.** The criteria of the perception of historical urban space in Wrocław, differentiation by party affiliation.
- Figure 11.1.** Different layers of self-identification in the Region of Bukovina.
- Figure 11.2.** (Un)willingness to move away from the region/locality: Results for variable 1 “I will do my best to move away from here,” and variable 2 “Given the chance, I would gladly move to Romania/Ukraine.”
- Figure 11.3.** Native language in Bukovina.
- Figure 11.4.** Everyday language practices in the northern and southern parts of Bukovina.

Acknowledgments

This edited volume has benefited from the input of a number of organizations and individuals to whom we would like to express our deep gratitude. The main part of the book was previously published as a special issue of *Journal of Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society (JSPPS)* entitled *Remembering Diversity in East-Central European Cityscapes*. Several chapters have their beginning in the international project *The Memory of Vanished Population Groups in Today's East in Central European Memory Treatment and Urban Planning in L'viv, Chernivtsi, Chişinău and Wrocław* conducted between 2010 and 2014 at Lund University and coordinated by Dr Bo Larsson. The project was affiliated with the Centre for European Studies and financed by the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation. Special thanks are thus directed toward these two organizations whose generous support also made possible publication of another book that presents findings of the project, *At Home or Abroad? Chişinău, Chernivtsi, L'viv and Wrocław: Living with Historical Changes to Borders and National Identities* (edited by Bo Larsson, Universus Academic Press, 2020). Participants of the project also gratefully acknowledge the grant F13-0011:1 issued by the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation. It enabled organization of the pre-publication workshop *Cultural Diversity in East-Central European Borderlands: Cityscapes, Memories, People* held in Lund in 2013.

We are grateful to Dr Andreas Umland, the editor of the book series *Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society*, and Valerie Lange, a commissioning editor of *ibidem* Verlag, for their encouragement to develop the special issue into a full-fledged book. Likewise, we gratefully acknowledge the helpful suggestions of several academic colleagues who provided peer-reviews of the chapters that initially appeared in the JSPPS issue.

In the process of work on their respective chapters several contributors obtained financial and other support for which they wish to thank a number of organizations and individuals.

Eleonora Narvselius expresses her gratitude to Leibniz-Institut für Geschichte und Kultur des östlichen Europa (GWZO) at the

University of Leipzig for the grant that permitted the advancement and conclusion of the introductory chapter. Narvselius' other contribution to the volume, a case study of the commemoration of Polish academics murdered in wartime Lviv, was previously published in Swedish in the academic journal *Nordisk Østforum*. A grant from the Erik Philip-Sørensen Foundation made this research possible and was thus much appreciated. Special thanks go to Prof. John Czaplicka for the endorsement of this publishing project at its early stage.

Hana Cervinkova and Juliet Golden would like to thank Tadeusz Włodarczak for generously sharing his recollections of the unique experience (1982–97) of protecting and restoring the Old Jewish Cemetery of Wrocław.

An earlier version of Gaëlle Fisher's chapter was initially part of a special issue, *Bukovina and Bukovinians after the Second World War*. She would like to thank the journal *East European Politics and Societies* for permission to reprint and the editors of this volume and, in particular, Eleonora Narvselius for the opportunity to publish a revised version of this study.

Anastasia Felcher's research was made possible by grant no. 17-18-01589 obtained from the Russian Science Foundation and held at the Institute of Scientific Information on Social Sciences, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow (INION RAN). Alexandr Voronovici's case study was also supported by the Russian Science Foundation under grant 17-18-01589.

Finally, we would like to give our sincere thanks to designer Olena Myshanska, who provided us with the original cover image that excellently captures the tenor of the book.

ELEONORA NARVSELIUS

JULIE FEDOR

Introduction

Remembering Diversity in East-Central European Cityscapes

Eleonora Naroselius

Abstract: *The contributions to this special issue explore the multi-layered urban environments of East-Central European borderlands. They bring into focus the cityscapes of Wrocław, Lviv, Chernivtsi, and Chişinău, where the legacies of Nazism, Marxist-Leninism, and violent ethno-nationalism have been revisited in recent decades in search of profound moral reckoning and in response to the challenges posed by the (post)transitional period. While much has been written about the history of these cities, there is a dearth of knowledge about how their contemporary residents make sense of the cityscapes stripped of their historical populations, and how they deal with the history and memory of those populations. This introductory essay suggests a tentative approach to the analysis of engagements with the lost diversity in historical urban milieus full of post-war voids and ruptures. In particular, it tests the possibility of combining the theoretical propositions of Memory Studies with broader conceptualizations of borderlands, cosmopolitan sociality, and hybridity.*

Introduction¹

This volume explores the urban environments of the East-Central European borderlands, bringing to the fore the material and symbolic landscapes of four historically interconnected cities. Wrocław, Lviv,² Chernivtsi, and Chişinău were stripped of their historical populations in the twentieth century and continue to wrestle with

-
- 1 This text continues the theoretical line of argument presented in Narvoselius (2020).
 - 2 Different house styles suggest different transcriptions for the soft sign (ѣ) characteristic of the Russian, Ukrainian, Belarusian, and Bulgarian alphabets. In this issue, we have opted to use the spelling “Lviv” (except in Bo Larsson’s chapter, where we retain the soft sign (L’viv) for consistency with the transliteration of the names of other cities discussed in the article.)

the legacies of Nazism, Marxist-Leninism, and radical ethno-nationalism. These “peripheral cities in the middle of Europe”³ have by no means been “typical” sluggish provincial spots populated by people with uncertain identities and shifting loyalties; throughout history they were at the epicenter of pan-European and global political processes, trade, transcultural exchange, and the clashes of grand ideologies. Since the collapse of communist regimes, these cities have been keen to project an image of themselves as hubs of cultural diversity generating innovative spaces, inclusive identities, and multicultural common heritage (Murzyn 2008: 317). However, the actual state of affairs is more complicated; in fact, these urban landscapes provide plenty of examples of plural mono-ethnic heritage, while multi-ethnic hybridity and mutual engagement are less mainstream. A good deal of evidence indicates that although these cityscapes might function as effective channels for transmission of an array of outlooks, attitudes, and values, the surface impression of inclusive identities, tolerance, and peaceful sharing of the urban space may be misleading.

The most recent and memorable watershed addressed in each article is the collapse of the Soviet-dominated political system. While post-socialist transformations of urban landscapes and the quest for new urban identities have been addressed in a bulk of academic publications (see, for example, Czaplicka, Ruble, and Crabtree 2003; Huyssen 2003; Stanilov 2007; Czepczyński 2008; Young and Kaczmarek 2008; Bartetzky, Dmitrieva, and Kliems 2009; Czaplicka, Gelazis, and Ruble 2009; Darieva, Kaschuba, and Krebs 2011; Diener and Hagen 2013; Diener and Hagen 2015; Krase and Uherek 2017), much less is known about the ways in which contemporary urbanites make sense of cityscapes stripped of their historical population groups, and how they handle the history and memory of these populations.⁴ How, and more importantly, why

3 I have borrowed this expression from the title of Bo Larsson’s book *Periferin i Europas mitt* (Larsson 2011).

4 Nevertheless, there exists a bulk of academic literature on Jewish spaces of Eastern Europe, especially in Poland; see, for example, Gruber (2002); Murzyn (2006); Bartov (2007); Hirsch and Spitzer (2010); Meng (2011); Lehrer and Meng (2015); Törnquist-Plewa (2016). Also, the recent book by Uilleam Blacker (2019)

do contemporary residents invoke historical diversity and make of it a closed or an open-ended resource? What has changed since the previous socialist/Soviet epoch? Above all, what do contemporary transformations of the cityscapes tinted by the presence of historical “others” say about the present-day societies?

In the words of Henri Lefebvre, “City is forged as an appropriated space” (Lefebvre 1991: 31); cityscapes constantly produce new “lived, conceived and perceived realms” of representation and action (*ibid.*: 40). The fractured spatial texture of contemporary borderline cities is particularly suitable for experiments with (re)appropriations of “foreign” spaces, (radical) re-drawings of borders between “otherness” and “outness,” and the (selective) recall of forgotten pasts. To facilitate analysis of these processes and without getting bogged down in their historiography, this introductory essay scrutinizes contemporary engagements with the lost diversity and appropriations of the East-Central European cityscapes. In particular, it makes the case for combining broader conceptualizations of borderlands, cosmopolitan sociality, and hybridity with theoretical propositions drawn from the field of Memory Studies.

Texture of Diversity in East-Central European Borderland Cities: Voids Filled and Voids Still Gaping

In the 2000s, an interesting trend emerged in Wrocław, Lviv, Chernivtsi, and Chişinău. All of a sudden, small anthropomorphic statues and other decorative objects hinting at human presence popped up in the streets and squares. Wrocław is presently famous for its bronze dwarves, whose number since the installation of the first Daddy Dwarf in 2001 has exceeded 100. What on first impression looks like an extravagant branding gimmick, is actually a reference to the Orange Alternative, an anti-communist underground movement that claimed the dwarf as its symbol in the 1980s. On the other

dwelling into how residents of several Eastern European cities have addressed memories of lost population groups in the wake of World War II, is a valuable contribution to research literature on urban memory.

side of Poland's eastern border, in Lviv, tourists take pictures of funny *batiaryky*. These bronze figurines popping up along tourist routes in the downtown area allude to the pre-war subculture of *batiary*, "lovable rogues" immortalized in the local folklore. In the landscape of the western Ukrainian city, *batiary* evoke the myth of Polish Lwów, exciting and perilous at one and the same time. In Chernivtsi, yet another western Ukrainian city with a complicated history, several objects that disrupt the conventional understanding of public monumental art can be seen in the downtown area. One of these is a bronze horse carriage alluding to the *fin de siècle*, metropolitan elegance, and European fashion. Another is the antique bicycle with a huge front wheel, as if casually left by its owner at a plaza with the evocative name "Turkish Well." These two installations arouse the mixed feelings of amusement and melancholy which usually accompany abandoned status objects that no longer have utility in present-day life. In the capital of Moldova, one may see another interesting "urban hieroglyph." An illuminated shield at the entrance to a hip restaurant is decorated with a portrait of a bearded middle-aged man. The inscription below reads "Karl Schmidt." Evidently, owners of the venue decided to put their business on the map by referring to a legendary mayor of Chişinău that was then part of the Russian empire. From time to time one also comes across non-monumental visual references to the pre-war Jews. However, like the Jewish restaurant "Under the Golden Rose" in Lviv and figurines of "lucky Jews" on sale in Polish cities,⁵ they follow the same logic of pop-cultural presentation that elevates stereotypic features and uncomplicated narratives.

Despite obvious differences between these post-socialist cityscapes, a knowledgeable observer may detect their common ambience. Wrocław, Chernivtsi, Lviv, and Chişinău have traditionally been hubs of the historical borderland regions of Silesia, Bukovina, Galicia, and Bessarabia, proverbial for their motley populations and patchworks of languages and religions. In turn, this also implied that from being sites of seemingly harmonious co-existence and cultural exchange, they periodically became arenas for interethnic

5 On "lucky Jew" figurines in Poland see Lehrer (2014).

conflict and brutal violence. The contemporary urge to “re-populate” their urban nooks and crannies might be interpreted in more general terms as an effort aimed at the re-scaling, de-monumentalization, and individualization of the cityscapes that still bear traces of socialist/Soviet grand mythologies. At the same time, this is also a remarkable act of civic magic triggered by reactions to the EU and NATO enlargements, the settling of scores with “two totalitarianisms,” and fears linked to mass migration. This magical act highlights a perceived absence of human beings lost in the historical cataclysms and, consequently, emulates a presence of friendly, benevolent, and desirable “others.” One may continue this line of argument by evoking the apt metaphor of ghosts and spirits of memory suggested by Aleida Assmann (2011: 1-5).⁶ In places and times of existential and political insecurity people summon benevolent “spirits,” or positively colored presentations of bygone times, in an effort to withstand the scary “ghosts” of an unburied past. Under such circumstances, the cute figurines and images serve as public amulets conveying a comforting aura of innocence and wellbeing.

Meanwhile, symbolic “re-populations” of the urban space might also be propelled by a different logic. It seems that in cities profoundly shaped by legacies of expulsions, ethnic violence, and the Holocaust, there is a need to “camouflage the wounds of failed diversity” (Czaplicka, Ruble, and Crabtree 2003: 17) or, in Kenneth E. Foote’s terminology (2003), to “rectify” places of memory that for some people are still associated with disturbing experiences of injustice, loss, and crime. The latter treatment presupposes a partial and selective erasure of the traces of a disaster; in effect the place may become unarticulated and bereft of meaning, as “[n]o sense of honor or dishonor remains attached to the site; it is, so to speak, exonerated of involvement in the tragedy” (*ibid.*: 23). Resistance to rectification may come from different groups, including both representatives of the displaced urban communities, and local activists insisting on acknowledgement of the original sites of memory.

6 On ghosts as a metaphor with ethical and political potential, and on the theoretically informed “spectral turn” see Davis (2007) and Blanco and Peeren (2013).

Nevertheless, there is no guarantee that rectification will morph into the next phases, i.e. “consecration” and “sanctification” of memorable sites and establishment of healing commemorative practices (*ibid.*: 7–10).

Oftentimes, to describe the fragmentary and multilayered quality of the cityscapes that withstood historical cataclysms and massive human loss, one uses the metaphor of palimpsest. Like any trope, however, it has its conceptual limitations (Huysen 2003: 7; Silverman 2013: 3–8). The image of a palimpsest visualizes the possibility of retrieving some undamaged authentic layers exposed through breaches of the recent overwritings and re-dressings. Yet such retrieval is hardly possible in places where the whole demographic structure and economic organization were obliterated while material structures remained practically intact. Under such circumstances, it makes sense to talk about voids—symbolic, epistemological, emotional—which are palpable and which the present-day residents of these cities try to patch up. Voids are not merely omissions that still presuppose the ability of the living population to “decode” and partially retrieve the urban text. They are rather “the multiple of nothing” (Bowden and Duffy 2012: 46), brought about by the paucity of information available for the urban explorer, by her emotional detachment from the collective past, and by the complexity of the loss that resists coherent representation. Perceived voids in the texture of the cityscapes produce disturbing voids of meaning which today’s residents are tempted to fill in by inscribing them into “a bigger whole of being, a deity, a state, a nation, or the impersonal authority of the law” (Wydra 2015: 25). Such appropriation unavoidably disassembles the articulated “places of memory” associated with the “others” and substitutes them with “memories of place” projected by the present-day urbanites (Truc 2012).

The shapes and content of the urban milieus discussed in this book derive from combinations of cultural continuities and political ruptures, “representations of space” conceived by the elites, “representational spaces” of inhabitants and users (Lefebvre 1991: 3–50), present-day heritage industries, and individual efforts to make

sense of the contentious past. Gaping voids that interlock collective memories with built environments and their symbolic re-mediations, are profoundly political. They disrupt the imagined consistency of the urban landscape, they provoke efforts of interpretation and, subsequently, trigger competition and conflict among social actors coming up with their own, more or less articulated versions of the past (Dwyer and Alderman 2008: 171). Paradoxically, instead of filling the gaps, the practice of ornamenting the public spaces with fairy-tale entities, legendary figures, and melancholic artefacts oftentimes makes urban voids even more obvious.

East-Central European Borderlands as a Cluster of Regional Distinctions, Banal Cosmopolitanism, and Urban Myths

The specificity and at the same time comparability of the selected cities stem not only from their modes of coping with the voids left by the legacies of large-scale violence, but from their position as frontiers of geopolitical expansion and stakes of great power rivalries. These characteristics can be aptly addressed with the help of the concept of borderlands. As particular types of spatial regimes, European borderlands have been formed by discourses focusing on their special anthropogeographic conditions, cultural-historical distinctiveness, and political designs (Mishkova and Trencsenyi 2017: 8). Borderlands are commonly regarded as peripheries or margins of certain territorial entities, usually nation-states (Diener and Hagen 2010), whose particular conditions and local color are rooted in the past. However, the cultural fragmentation and *mélange* of borderlands are anything but local anomalies belonging to history. On the contrary, they have to be acknowledged as basic features of modern spatial orders “where identities and experiences are constantly being contested in specific sites or localized centers of power” (Lugo 1997: 53).

The concept of borderlands connotes problematic places where competition, appropriation, and violence have been the flip-side of the co-existence of various ethnicities, religions, and other

symbolic orders (Bartov and Weitz 2013). Hence, what is crucial to the understanding of borderlands is not only their material topography and location in political grand projects, but also specific modalities of power pertaining to appropriation, production, and contestation of diversity (Mishkova and Trescenyi 2017: 2). In particular, borderlands often assume centrality in matters of symbolic politics due to daily entanglements with “otherness” and the rich texture of constraints and opportunities. This is especially true in post-1989 East-Central Europe where labeling some regions as “borderlands” became an effective tool for crafting certain normative visions of the post-communist development. These visions are not always based on historically correct estimations of borderland diversity, as they are primarily aimed at serving the neoliberal agenda of the peripheral elites who exploit local cultural capital in the hope of enhancing the competitiveness of their regions (Zarycki 2011: 90–97). Nevertheless, such whipping up of regional distinction is not a completely new phenomenon. As pockets of social and political instability and spaces of non-compliance with centrally imposed regulations, borderland regions have often been used for large-scale social experiments and political projects combining transformations of material environments with fostering a new type of political subject (Bartov and Weitz 2013; Amar 2015; Gross 1988).

Political projects of uniformization notwithstanding, in East-Central European borderlands, and especially in their urban milieus, certain facets of cultural diversity pertained throughout the calamities of the twentieth century. One such facet is a constant exposure to the scrutinizing gaze of the “other,” whether literally or metaphorically. This may happen through daily (and mostly unreflective) contact with material milieus, borrowed words, pieces of folklore, and family stories that hint at the presence of a “foreign” *spiritus loci* within a familiar cultural landscape. Another characteristic feature is a “banal” cosmopolitanism designating the borderland as “a prolonged time and a border space, in which people learn the ways of the world and of other people, ... [and] thus the place where a ... cosmopolitan subject is emerging” (Agier 2016: 9). This type of cosmopolitanism often emerges through public interactions

linked to specific places, “from market squares to basement taverns to elegant clubs: places that had indeed often been built to enable... cosmopolitan sociality” (Humphrey 2012: 20). As such, the cosmopolitan sociality serves as a strategy making it possible to quickly stitch together the social fabrics torn by internal conflicts and rapid political transformations. It can efficiently conceal voids left by the drastic or gradual disappearance of whole segments of the urban populace by switching the focus to overarching symbols of central power, intellectual goods, and the latest fashions preoccupying local bohemians. It may be argued that the strategy of symbolic accretion described by Dwyer and Alderman goes hand-in-hand with “banal” urban cosmopolitanism. In a manner analogous to the geologic processes of sedimentation, uplift, and erosion, borderland cityscapes are susceptible to “over-writing, embellishment, and erasure... thought of in terms of what has been called symbolic accretion.” As a result, “different historical meanings are layered onto them, thus challenging the notion that these symbols have a final, established meaning” (Dwyer and Alderman 2008: 169–70).

Symbolic accretion, cosmopolitan sociality, and urban pockets of difference link to another significant feature that makes this set of cities comparable. Wrocław, Lviv, Chernivtsi, and Chişinău are places that have generated a plethora of stories and projected their own—often competing—“myths” referring to their borderline status and the unique quality of their urban life (see in particular the chapter by Czajkowski in this volume). For more than a century, the *Semper fidelis* myth of Polish Lwów clashed with the myth of the same city as the capital of “Ukrainian Piedmont,” but the present-day urban mythology elevates the “golden age” of the benevolent Habsburg empire and multicultural ambience of the city. In post-1991 Chernivtsi, the mythology of Ukrainian national liberation coexists with the *Bukovina Mythos* originating from the Habsburg epoch and pinpointing a one-of-a-kind patchwork of languages and cultures as well as an ideal version of urban tolerance. Wrocław/Breslau has been glorified as a unique place of creativity, academic achievement, and enterprise, contested in the German and Polish imagery, but nowadays the focus has shifted to bridging

the rifts with the help of a new EU mythology professing openness to the world and an end to national antagonisms. The Russian imperial myth of Chişinău as an urban patchwork with an oriental touch is nowadays eclipsed by national mythologies glorifying the great history of the Moldavian/Romanian people/s, but it is still viable in many contexts, not least artistic and literary ones. Urban mythologies expose complex transnational itineraries that connect Lviv with Wrocław, Chernivtsi with Chişinău, and Lviv with Chernivtsi in multiple ways. In turn, the issue of complex cross-border relations leads us to another conceptual pillar of this book, namely the problematic of transnational memories and memory cultures that both (trans)form and (re)mediate imagery of the historical diversity that is not here anymore, but still reverberates in multiple public and private contexts.

Recollecting Bygone Urban Diversity: Performative Memories, Postmemory, and Prosthetic Memory

Following a long tradition of viewing cityscapes as books and literary palimpsests, it has often been assumed that traces of the bygone diversity can be read “between the lines,” sometimes even as coherent subchapters, by philosophically-minded local flâneurs, scholars sensitized to cultural-historical details, and even by inquisitive tourists. Alternatively, cityscapes may be viewed as codes and signs (Huysen 2003) relating not only to texts and narratives, but also to practices, emotions, and attitudes. The question is, what exactly can be “decoded” in the urban spaces nowadays, under what circumstances, and by whom? Can urban newcomers and their descendants feel deeper attachment to the sites that used to be “emotional magnets” (Collins 2004: 80) for the previous populations? How are these parts of the cityscape actualized in our time, if at all? And how can one make sense of urban “voids”? Contemporary cityscapes are populated not so much by ghosts and spirits of the past, but by living people with their own ideas about belonging, origins, and community. Hence, when dealing with present-day borderland cityscapes, the analyst steps into a hybrid space of action, memory, hearsay, and imagination imbedded into—and constitutive for—

the “material city” (see Boyer 1994; Crang and Travlou 2001; Srinivas 2001; Huyssen 2003; Crinson 2005; Legg 2007; Till 2005; Jordan 2006; Törnquist-Plewa 2016).

Throughout this edited volume, the contributors have tried to make sense of the complex interplay between the mosaic-like built environments typical of Eastern European cities marked by “dis-membered multiethnicity” (Follis 2012: 181), and the contemporary attitudes to the pre-war urban populations who created these milieus, but perished in the twentieth century. The authors have been primarily interested in how some clues available in present-day urban environments correlate with identity-forming knowledge about the past, often referred to as cultural or collective memories (Assmann J. 2010: 123; Kansteiner 2002: 179–97; Radstone and Hodgkin 2003). Following the sociological current in Memory Studies (for example, Olick 2007: 114–115), it makes sense to abandon the idea of material milieus as something that “contains” or “preserves” cultural memories. After all, memories cannot emanate from the stones. Material environments are complex products of practices and ideologies, which actualize cultural memories of constantly changing urban populations in a myriad of ways (see Conneron 1989; Boyer 1994; Crang and Travlou 2001; Huyssen 2003; Hoelscher and Alderman 2004; Crinson 2005; Hebbert 2005; Jordan 2006; Foote and Azaryahu 2007; Legg 2007). Moreover, it cannot go unnoticed that for the current populations the legacies of urban pasts are a matter of active imagining and virtualization rather than a painstaking recollection of the past in its own right. As Andreas Huyssen explains, in urban contexts, “an urban imaginary in its temporal reach may well put different things in one place: memories of what there was before, imagined alternatives to what there is. The strong marks of present space merge in the imaginary with traces of the past, erasures, losses, and heterotopias” (Huyssen 2003: 7).

Following the analytical framework suggested by the anthropologist Setha Low, urban memories may be approached as a necessary attribute of the social construction of the city space. Unlike the social production of space that comprises social, economic,

ideological, and technological factors focusing on the physical creation of the material setting, the social construction of space is underpinned by daily exchanges, memories, and images which convey symbolic meanings (Low 1996: 862). Although urban memory links to concrete physical imprints of the city, nevertheless, much like other types of memory – personal, generational, political, and cultural – it tends to defy “the orthodoxy of correct interpretation” (Huyssen 2003: 19). Meanwhile, efforts to impose correct interpretations of the cityscape are a daily enterprise undertaken by multiple groups and individuals. If earlier it was Marxist-Leninist ideology that edited the East-Central European urban milieus by means of removing monuments, toponymics, and inscriptions and bulldozing religious edifices, nowadays one witnesses efforts to cleanse the urban landscape of the vestiges of socialist histories by similar means, removing undesirable traces from the streets and city maps, as has recently been the case in Ukraine on the wave that followed the adoption of the so-called de-communization laws.

An obvious specificity of urban memory compared with other analytically distinguished memory types is its complex relation to space and materiality. Well-used, but also vividly criticized for being too static and nostalgic, the concept of *lieux de mémoire* is still a workable analytical approach allowing us to frame entanglements of urban space, historical materiality and cultural memory (Nora and Kritzman 1996–1998). Alternative, but also complementary analytical suggestions evoke metaphors of texts, arenas, and performances, and thus enable unpacking of the dynamic and improvisatory nature of urban memorial landscapes (Dwyer and Alderman 2008: 165–78). Remembrance is performative rather than simply reproductive, as when people come together to do the work of remembrance, the story they fashion is different from those that have come before (Tilmans, van Vree, and Winter 2010: 7). Hence, again, the past is constantly affirmed and transformed through discourses and practices evoking imagination and virtualization of the past understood as “construction of what might, ought, or could have existed but actually did not; and, one step further, the construction

of what the visitors expect to have existed but actually could not have" (Ashworth 1991: 192).

The performative aspect of cultures of remembrance is underpinned by "imaginative investment, projection, and creation" (Hirsch 2008: 107) practiced by memory actors. Varying grades and forms of such actualization of memories about the urban past make the mnemonic landscapes of the four chosen cities dissimilar. As the chapters in this volume demonstrate, while the "weight of the past," exemplified by cultural links, architectural environment, and structuring of historical narratives, is largely comparable in Lviv, Wrocław, Chişinău, and Chernivtsi, the "choice of the past" (Mink and Neumayer 2013: 10) – charged with the interests, emotions, and imagination of the contemporary rank-and-file urbanites, mnemonic activists, politicians, and cultural experts – is what makes the difference. Or, to use the already mentioned metaphor from Aleida Assmann, while these cities are haunted by similar ghosts of the past, they purposefully seek contact with different spirits of the past.

Almost seventy years after the events that stripped Wrocław, Lviv, Chişinău, and Chernivtsi of most of their pre-war populations, the progeny of newcomers – much like today's descendants of pre-war urbanites that live mainly abroad – have no first-hand personal memory either of these dramatic events or of the way of life that preceded them. In this respect, these two important groups of memory actors – who currently commission monuments, renovate religious buildings, organize commemorative events, and make efforts to preserve memories about the cities they care about – are in the same situation. Both actively "choose" the past they strive to elucidate and reenact. Both experiment with imagination and virtualization of "their own" histories. Nevertheless, the sources of their creative work, second-hand knowledge, and emotional attachment to the past, are different. Typically, the offspring of the older population groups rely on family archives and personal stories of relatives, while the children of the newcomers extract their knowledge about the past primarily from much more fragmentary and impersonal sources that do not speak for themselves

(e.g., the architectural environment, movies, literary works, interiors, and artifacts). The difference between these two types of memory work may be conceptualized in terms of the difference between postmemory (Hirsch 2008), the afterlife of “living” memory of witnesses shared across generations of “legitimate custodians,” and prosthetic memory, a past reconstructed from the position of emotional and aesthetical distance. Prosthetic memories are generated not within families, but rather through accessible public domains such as literature, film, museums, and theater (Landsberg 2004). As a product of various mediations, they tend to be visual-factual rather than sensual-emotional (O’Keeffe 2007: 5).

Combinations of both types of memory work are especially evident in connection with public commemorative initiatives and the symbolic marking of public urban spaces. Without denying that oftentimes “[g]uilt, resentment, denial, powerful political taboos, and the imperative of dealing with the national trauma all combined to block the formation of memory of vanished others” (Blacker 2013: 178), several contributions to this volume (in particular, the articles by Felcher, Larsson, and Otrishchenko) contend that the work of filling tangible and intangible “voids” of the post-war urban environments in Eastern Europe has not only frustrating limitations, but also enabling qualities. Although transnational commemorative co-operation around the legacy of the perished urban groups and partial Europeanization of commemorative discourses often looks like a superficial “disturbance of homogeneity” (Furumark 2013) from above and outside, nevertheless one should not dismiss their impact on urbanites and their perception of cultural diversity. Equally, despite the fact that the efforts of the present-day inhabitants of the four cities to come to terms with difficult pasts may not always be unalloyed success stories, it would be inherently wrong to imply that the capacity to “read” and “feel” urban places of memory is something reserved only for the legitimate custodians of postmemory.