

could not have been maintained, and which could not have overcome—for very long—the internal differences.

During the last days of Ludolf's life (he was seventy when he died on August 21, 1422) he continued to work on his "Tractatus," and was sure that God would sooner or later destroy the Hussite heresy. Instead, the Hussite revolution lasted until 1436, and the Hussite reformation, in the form of the Utraquist Church and the Church of the Brethren, lasted far into the period of the German and Swiss reformations. But for the early years of the movement Ludolf's contribution to our knowledge of the Hussites and their enemies is of considerable value, and Machilek's careful historical study will help us in this special field.

F. G. HEYMANN
University of Calgary

IDEAS OF RELIGIOUS TOLERATION AT THE TIME OF JOSEPH II:
A STUDY OF THE ENLIGHTENMENT AMONG CATHOLICS IN
AUSTRIA. By *Charles H. O'Brien*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, new series, vol. 59, part 7. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1969. 80 pp. \$2.50, paper.

The question of how extensive, self-conscious, and autochthonous the Austrian Enlightenment was continues to be a subject of debate. (See, for example, Paul Bernard's recent *Jesuits and Jacobins*, Urbana, 1971.) In this clear, solid monograph Professor O'Brien takes up the controversy over religious toleration in Joseph's Austria. The first half of the work discusses how a climate of opinion favorable to toleration developed during Joseph's coregency, how and why the Edict of Toleration and kindred measures were promulgated and enforced, and what impact they had in various parts of the Monarchy. In the remainder of the book O'Brien presents the arguments used by enlightened Catholics and Jansenists to defend toleration against its conservative opponents, and the appeals of secular humanists for much wider toleration based on the principle of the secular state. The author's main thesis and chief contribution to the debate over the roots and significance of Josephinism is the argument that toleration was not merely an expedient for political or mercantilist ends, or a product of religious indifference, either for Joseph or for many reform Catholic leaders. Religious as well as utilitarian grounds were important: toleration was conceived as charity directed toward non-Catholics—something which Christ's example as well as the spirit of the age required.

I agree with the thesis and sympathize with O'Brien's effort to present the controversy as essentially one of religious thought and polity, without engaging in political, psychological, or socioeconomic reductionism. Still, the question remains whether a tolerant reformed Catholicism represented a stable position in Austria, either doctrinally or practically. O'Brien points out how doubtful was the orthodoxy of some enlightened Catholic leaders, and how keenly Jansenists in particular felt the tension between their concern for true doctrine and Christian life and their attraction to certain Enlightenment principles. He does not seem to have asked himself, however, just where Joseph's toleration was likely to lead him, the church, and the state, regardless of its roots and motives. In retrospect, one might conclude

that Joseph's brand of toleration was preserved only because Francis stopped its progress, ossified it, and gave far greater attention to the security of the state church.

PAUL W. SCHROEDER
University of Illinois, Urbana

DER ÖSTERREICHISCH-UNGARISCHE AUSGLEICH 1867: MATERI-ALIEN (REFERATE UND DISKUSSION) DER INTERNATIONALEN KONFERENZ IN BRATISLAVA 28. 8.—1. 9. 1967. Edited by *Anton Vantuch*. Bratislava: Vydavateľ'stvo Slovenskej akadémie vied, 1971. 1,076 pp. Kčs. 120.

The international conference which met in Bratislava in the late summer of 1967 to evaluate the Ausgleich of 1867 concentrated on five major themes: a retrospective assessment of its origins and significance, the reaction of great and small powers to its rather swift evolution, the social, economic, and constitutional problems of the period, the effects of the compromise upon the nationalities of the Habsburg domain, and a consideration of alternative federalistic programs. Predictably, the papers dealing with the attitudes of the peoples of the empire toward Dualism make up the larger part of the deliberations. Closing summaries were in agreement that much still needs to be done in investigating economic history, the role of the churches and political parties, the activities of the diets in the Austrian realm, German Austrian and Magyar liberalism, social structure, and education. György Ránki aptly warns, "We may be in danger of approaching our subject in too general a manner and of repeating facts well known to all without making any real progress" (p. 1045). Amid the repetitions, however, there is much of essential interest to students of Central and East European history.

Robert A. Kann's contribution insists upon judging the compromise according to the purposes of its creators, who wished to preserve the monarchy's position as a great power and to yield to an absolute minimum of social change. The ruling powers in Vienna and Budapest felt they were securing the necessary military muscle at a cost of granting limited constitutional liberties and of some decentralization of executive power. If Hungary suffered economic disabilities as a result, it was the upper bourgeoisie who paid the bill, not the magnates and gentry. As for a federalistic settlement, Kann obviously feels that the economic interests of the dominant classes were a colossal barrier to ethnic solutions before or after 1867. The same classes recognized in the alliance with the German Empire the best way to preserve their power. The renewed life which the alliance guaranteed Austria-Hungary permitted a minimum of national and constitutional protection in Austria and "did not entirely preclude the possibility of similar developments in Hungary" (p. 44).

Fran Zwitter in similar vein accents the conclusions of the German Austrian bureaucracy and of its sometime foes, the German Austrian Liberals, that a settlement with the Magyars was necessary to defend Germanism in Austria. Again, the elaboration of the thesis that provinces had an historic individuality persuaded Bohemian and Galician aristocrats that an agreement with their fellow nobles in Hungary would prevent the formation of ethnic unities that might bring on total dissolution. Deák's distaste for revolutionary solutions and his insistence upon one Hungarian citizenship, with territorial autonomy for Croatia, was the final determining factor.

Ránki is concerned that such emphases on the intentions and zeal of the prota-