

dent of Western Europe but owing something to renewed contacts with north Germany. It came with the liberalization of the censorship, which allowed more freedom at least in discussion of religious topics, and with the growth of a book-selling trade in Vienna, the spread of Masonic lodges, and the phenomenon of poet-bureaucrats, or men who published tracts, pamphlets, or literary efforts while holding government employments. Except for a chapter each on Joseph von Sonnenfels and Joseph Richter, the book deals with writers little known outside Austria; but the very number of these lesser figures, with well-selected quotation of their ideas, persuades us that there was indeed a new and "enlightened" intelligentsia in the Habsburg dominions. Since only a few were former Jesuits who remained after the dissolution of the order, and since the author finds that the Vienna "Jacobins" of 1794 were neither important nor typical of the preceding enlightenment, the theme of the book is better indicated by its subtitle than by its a bit too catchy title.

The short final chapter gives a useful review of the historiography of Joseph II and Josephinism. The author denies that Joseph was a "revolutionary emperor" or that he sought to implement a body of ideas proposed by writers, but he thinks that these writers, some of whom were temporarily fairly radical, produced a kind of public opinion in which Joseph's measures, aimed at shifting public authority from the church to the state, could gain acceptance.

R. R. PALMER
Yale University

BOHEMICA: PROBLEME UND LITERATUR SEIT 1945. By *Ferdinand Seibt*. *Historische Zeitschrift*, Sonderheft 4. Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1970. iv, 355 pp. DM 36, paper.

The series of supplements to *Historische Zeitschrift* was inaugurated in 1962 and appears, under the editorship of Professor Walther Kienast, at irregular intervals. Whereas each of the earlier volumes contained essays surveying several countries, the fourth Sonderheft is entirely devoted to Czech history. The author, professor at the Ruhr University (Bochum), is a specialist in this field and has to his credit a book on the Hussite revolution and a number of minor studies and articles in learned periodicals. He is interested in both medieval and modern times and has joined several heated debates on current affairs. He has achieved distinction among those German scholars who obtained specialized training in the uneasy postwar years and moved rapidly to high positions in German academic institutions and in international scholarship.

Professor Seibt included in his survey the studies pertaining to Bohemia and Moravia, prior to the establishment of Czechoslovakia, as well as literature on the twenty years of independence. A chapter on Slovakia by Horst Glassl appeared in the third supplement, in 1969. In this reviewer's opinion it would have been more useful to extend the chronological limits to include the dismemberment of the republic in 1938-39 and the six years of terror in the Protectorate. They are a sad epilogue to the era of independence, not a prelude to the postwar developments.

According to the original assignment Seibt was expected to evaluate critically the production from 1945 to 1965. But publication of his study was delayed, and he had time to include some more recent works as they came to his notice. This extension of the period has its merits, but since the selection of additional titles

was more or less accidental, it caused disproportions. In Seibt's survey the Czech authors have the highest percentage. Next in line are German historians and publicists, especially those with a family background in Bohemia or Moravia. It is surprising how little has been done in France. American scholarship is not presented adequately. Some publications are simply listed in footnotes (e.g., p. 220, n. 984); comments on other books (S. H. Thomson's *Czechoslovakia in European History*, Keith Eubank's *Munich*) are casual, unsympathetic. A more systematic excerpting of periodicals such as the *Journal of Central European Affairs* and the *Slavic Review* would have yielded additional titles, no less important for the overall picture than some of the ephemeral publications in Czech or German.

The fourth Sonderheft will be of great help to specialists in Czechoslovakia on both sides of the Atlantic. Seibt has not produced a dry descriptive catalogue but a provocative study which not only shows what has been accomplished but also points out the gaps and the future tasks. He does not pretend to write as a dispassionate bibliographer, but often joins the polemical contest and gives his opinion freely. With the help of his survey, students of Slavic and Central European affairs will be able to follow such complicated processes as the gradual modification among the German authors of a flatly negative judgment on Czechoslovak home affairs. Even more impressive is the subtle differentiation by the author of the successive stages through which Czech history writing passed in a comparatively short period, 1945–65. Another contribution to this subject from Professor Seibt's pen, "Ideologie und Geschichte," appeared in 1971 in a Festschrift for Hermann Heimpel and is worth reading.

OTAKAR ODLOŽILÍK
University of Pennsylvania

NATIVE FASCISM IN THE SUCCESSOR STATES, 1918–1945. Edited by Peter F. Sugar. Introduction by Lyman H. Legters. Santa Barbara: American Bibliographical Center—Clio Press, 1971. iii, 166 pp. \$9.50, cloth. \$4.50, paper.

These papers were originally prepared for a memorable conference sponsored by the Graduate School of the University of Washington in April 1966. The outgrowth of an international conference on the "Nationality Problem in the Habsburg Monarchy in the Nineteenth Century," this reunion of the participants in Seattle dealt with a subject to which little attention had been paid until the mid-sixties—the problem of fascism in the Successor States. The parallel lectures on each of the Successor States—one by an illustrious East European scholar and the other by his opposite number in America—have been published together in this volume.

Fritz Fellner of the University of Salzburg gives a brilliant and, one may add, courageous description of proto-fascistic tendencies in Austria. His contribution is the more valuable because so little has been said on the subject by Austrian scholars. R. John Rath of Rice University gives a good account of the Dollfuss-Schuschnigg years, despite his known sympathies for Schuschnigg. Jan Havránek of Charles University in Prague and Joseph F. Zacek of the State University of New York at Albany resume the histories of Czech "non-fascism" and Slovak "clerico-fascism." György Ránki of the Institute of History of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and George Barany of Denver University give a good account of the complicated problem of the fascist currents in interwar Hungary. Henryk Wereszycki of the Jagellonian University of Kraków and Piotr S. Wandycz of Yale University con-