

coexisted in that "Capua of the spirit" beside the neurotic creativity, and the "democracy of style" that lasted much longer here than in Paris or London, affecting the arts, religion, popular festivals, and—he might have added—cuisine. (Why is there no chapter on gastronomy? Everyone knows that what really kept the empire together was goulash and Knödel.)

The defect of Mr. Johnston's Baedeker tour is that, unlike Baedeker, he does not discriminate. Some of his heroes have irrevocably changed the world of thought (and therefore of action); some, like Ernst Mach, were profound and influential even though later science has rejected their theories; but there were cranks, too, some harmless and some vicious, and somewhere in his five hundred pages Mr. Johnston ought to say so. If "Karl Kraus or Stefan Zweig would be astonished to learn that civilization has survived at all," it is small thanks to some of their neighbors. The ability to integrate thought is in itself neither good nor bad. Even those who agree that "thanks to a few Austrians sprinkled across North America and Great Britain, integrative thinking has not quite vanished" would not necessarily mention Michael Polanyi or Friedrich von Hayek in the same breath as Ernst Gombrich or Joseph Schumpeter.

The same lack of discrimination is evident when it comes to explaining rather than merely presenting these varied phenomena. There are plenty of excellent insights, not least on the benefits of rigorous classical education, however pedantic, in imparting linguistic and logical skills. But too often Mr. Johnston is "typically Austrian" (in Arthur Schnitzler's pejorative sense of the phrase) in selecting the most complicated and least plausible causation. Why should anyone suppose "that lower-middle class Viennese may have projected onto the kaftan-wearers of the Judengasse their own yearning for a simpler past" or that the levity of *Die Fledermaus* was "calculated to mask the disappointments of the liberal era"? If, "in a society, where every occurrence evoked a wish or an aversion and where every brush with officialdom ended in subterfuge, it was natural to postulate a zone of repressed memories to explain duplicity," why was psychoanalysis not developed in St. Petersburg or Naples? And is there any scientific evidence for asserting that "the Habsburg Empire harbored the world's most diverse gene pool," thereby favoring the breeding of both geniuses and misfits?

If Mr. Johnston has not succeeded entirely at his prodigious undertaking, if there are a few surprising omissions, too many summary treatments, and some unities of time and place more obvious to him than to your reviewer, one must nevertheless acknowledge that there is nothing quite like it in English or German as a guide to those who first presented as paradox what many suburban newspaper readers now regard as commonplace.

PETER PULZER
Christ Church, Oxford

MODERN HUNGARIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY. By *Steven Bela Vardy*. East European Monographs, 17. Boulder, Colo.: *East European Quarterly*, 1976. xii, 333 pp. \$16.50. Distributed by Columbia University Press, New York.

Few studies of Hungarian historiography have been available to Western scholars, even to those who read Hungarian. Steven B. Vardy has now contributed largely to filling the gap with an able study of Hungarian historians and history writing in this century, down to the Communist seizure of power after World War II.

Following a survey of Hungarian historiography from its origins, Vardy turns to his main subject. The *Geistesgeschichte* school, linked with the name of Gyula Szekfü, occupies a central place, as the dominant orientation in the historical sciences in interwar Hungary. Vardy's treatment of it is judicious; while lauding its breadth of outlook and the liberation it represented from the sometimes mechanical procedures

of positivist history, he does not minimize the mystifications which sprang from its philosophical idealism and intuitive approach. And he rightly emphasizes its importance: the other interwar schools—many of them surprisingly robust—defined themselves in terms of their disagreements with Szeffü and his followers (whose influence, moreover, persists even to the present day).

Vardy analyzes the roots of the changing outlook of Hungarian historians in the vicissitudes of Hungarian society and in the shifting currents of European thought, and points out the political implications of the positions taken by Hungary's interwar historians. His notes are exceptionally full; the reader will find in them references to a broad spectrum of Hungarian historical writings. An appendix lists individually all the volumes in the several collections of historical sources published in Hungary during the dualist and interwar periods.

One looks forward to Vardy's full-scale study, now in progress, of Hungarian historiography in the nineteenth century, intended as a companion volume to the present work. At the same time, one hopes his labors will inspire others to make at least a start on the study of history writing in Hungary since the war. Vardy believes the subject is still too close in time to permit an objective analysis; nevertheless, Hungary's postwar historians have produced an ample—and at the same time very uneven—literature, and students of the subject could only benefit from a survey of it, however provisional, if done with the lucidity, thoroughness, and balance which mark Vardy's book.

RICHARD E. ALLEN
Columbia University

THE BRITISH IMAGE OF HUNGARY, 1865/1870. By *Tibor Frank*. Theses in English and American, Department of English, L. Eötvös University, Budapest. Budapest: L. Eötvös University, 1976. 375 pp. 20 Ft., paper.

This doctoral thesis offers the reader more than the title leads him to expect. The extras include clumsy expositions on the investigation of foreign relations and the methodology of public-opinion research, more colorful and readable, but only slightly more relevant, biographies of diplomats, and an analysis of Habsburg diplomatic services. It is only in the last third of his book that Frank delivers on his title's promise.

He maintains that the Habsburg Empire engrossed "but a small segment of British opinion" and that the general public received only "meagre information" about it (p. 239). Attitudes toward Hungary varied widely among the informed, from those who had "ultra pro-Hungarian" opinions to those who held "extreme panslavist views; violently hostile anti-Roumanian feelings coexist with wildly pro-Bohemian sentiments" (p. 243). Such diversity of opinion was natural in England, where freedom of expression reigned, but the author, understandably, does not make this point.

Frank holds that the British were not interested in central Europe, having their attention focused instead on their own imperial expansion. In regard to the Habsburg Empire their main concern was economic: they would have preferred a laissez-faire policy in the trade between Britain and Austria to the Habsburg system of protective tariffs. They welcomed the *Ausgleich* of 1867 mainly because it pacified Hungary, the largest element in the Habsburg Empire, thus strengthening the latter as a bulwark against Russia. The opponents of the settlement, above all Lajos Kossuth, were looked on askance, while proponents, such as Ferenc Deák, "the Hungarian Whig," were given a very good press. The British were more interested in Hungary's nationalities problem than in its social problems but favored political, social, and economic improvements in general.

The impressively broad scope of Frank's sources includes substantial archival material, contemporary journals and periodicals, and respectable secondary sources.