and Slovenian literary foundations, while those of the Poles, Ruthenians, and Lusatian Sorbs are briefly covered in an appendix. In addition, the study includes a short review of the historical, political, and social background from which all these foundations began to emerge and operate, and it also provides a fair amount of information and detail about related societies. The book has two very helpful tables, a reasonably good bibliography, and a serviceable index.

Based on extensive research in published and archival material (some of it made available for the first time), the study constitutes a useful and to some extent original contribution to the understanding of one, mainly institutional, aspect of nineteenth-century Austro-Slavic cultural history. Noteworthy and certainly valuable is the idea of mutuality and cooperation, both in outlook and activity, of all these foundations. This idea enabled the author to conclude: "In spite of their many differences, it is possible to speak of and characterize a *matica movement* which commenced with the Serbs in Hungary in 1826 and thence spread to the other Austro-Slavs."

On the debit side there are, unfortunately, many typographical errors and several factual ones: for example, the first editor of *Vijenac* was Đuro Deželić and not August Šenoa (p. 49). Also Ivan Mažuranić was replaced as *ban* by Ladislav Pejačević not Khuen Hedervary (p. 47). Although some of the errors may be interpretatively dangerous (the Yugoslav Academy always appears under the incorrect name Croatian Academy), they do not seriously detract from the basic value of the book, which is the first systematic presentation of the many-sided *matica* movement. The book will be of interest to both literary critics and historians.

DAVOR KAPETANIĆ
University of Washington

HEINRICH VON HAYMERLE: AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN CAREER DIPLOMAT, 1828–81. By *Marvin L. Brown, Jr.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1973. xii, 238 pp.

As Austrian foreign minister for the brief period between October 1879 and October 1881, Heinrich von Haymerle is chiefly known for his role in the negotiations which led to the conclusion of the Three Emperors' Alliance of 1881 and to the imposition on Serbia in that same year of an alliance which reduced the Balkan state to a position of subservience to the monarchy. Haymerle has not fared well in historical writing. In some recent accounts he appears as a "cautious, correct, unadventurous official" with a "rather woebegone personality," as the "humdrum Haymerle," or, more favorably, as a "cautiously conservative, indefatigable worker, and a capable organizer." During the height of his career he was the constant target of the sharp and unkind wit of Bismarck, who referred to him as the "colorless, lusterless, wooden Viennese bureaucrat," who "uttered an emphatic 'No' three times on waking up in the morning for fear of having undertaken some commitment in his sleep."

In this biography Professor Brown recounts the career of this Habsburg diplomat through his early assignments and then his appointments as minister to Athens in 1870, to the Hague in 1872, and as ambassador to Rome in 1877. His attendance as an Austrian delegate at the Congress of Berlin in 1878 was followed by his assumption of the ministerial post in 1879. The emphasis throughout this account is on the events of Haymerle's life and career; an analysis of Austrian

foreign policy in the succeeding crises is not given. Although the author describes Haymerle as a "quiet and painstaking figure" (p. 105), the attempt is made to emphasize the Austrian minister's real achievements while in office.

The book is based almost exclusively on material in the Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, with less attention given to the literature on the subject. This condition is particularly apparent in the sections dealing with the Eastern Question, a problem which dominated Haymerle's career. In the bibliography the author has not included even such an obvious reference as M. A. Anderson, *The Eastern Question*. This deficiency has led to major and minor errors in questions of fact and interpretation. For instance, the Bulgarian exarchate controversy of the 1870s did not involve the "union of the Russian and Bulgarian churches" (p. 46); the issue in the Straits question during the discussions over the Three Emperors' Alliance concerned not "closure" but the multilateral nature of the agreements relating thereto. It is also difficult to accept the statement that Austrian policy after 1878 was "more enlightened . . . making Austria-Hungary's weight felt . . . but in a more subtle way" (p. 170).

Nevertheless, this book does give a balanced description of the career and character of an important Austrian diplomat whose reputation has certainly suffered in contrast to that of his undoubtedly stronger and more colorful contemporaries, Andrássy and Bismarck.

Barbara Jelavich
Indiana University

EGYHÁZI TÁRSADALOM A KÖZÉPKORI MAGYARORSZÁGON. By *Elemér Mályusz*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1971. 398 pp. 78 Ft.

This book without doubt marks a high point in the scholarly work of the world-renowned Hungarian historian, even though the original idea was formulated as early as the end of the 1940s in his university lectures (so we are told, at least, in the foreword). To characterize Mályusz's wide-ranging oeuvre here would take us far afield. Let us mention only that he has discussed the most varied periods of Hungarian history, always with the rest of Europe in mind, and has never wished to be identified exclusively as a medievalist. A glance at the outstanding work of the author's youth on the Palatine Alexander Leopold (*Sándor Lipót főherceg nádor iratai, 1790–1795*, Budapest, 1926) will clarify this.

The typical method employed in this book is as follows. The author does not confine himself—unlike many medievalists—to an exact exposition based on source criticism, but always seeks to place progressive sociocultural and socioeconomic aspects in the foreground of his investigation. This is evident in the chapter topics: the beginnings of Christianity in Hungary, the secular clergy (with a detailed classification), monachism, and the literature of the times, followed by an epilogue on the emergence of a secular educated class. Mályusz in developing his themes and theses is far from limiting himself to the narrow circle of Hungarian historiography, but places each question he seeks to answer in the broader European context—to say nothing of his great erudition in non-Hungarian sources and scholarly studies. It is thus regrettable that this work could not be published simultaneously in another language, such as English, German, or French. A fully detailed review would therefore be justified only if the book could be used by those who do not know Hungarian.