

(or king) of Bohemia and the German king (either as such or in his capacity as emperor), and that Bohemia was not merely parallel to the German realm in this sort of subordination to the emperor, but "dass Böhmen . . . in das deutsche *regnum* im staatsrechtlichen Sinne fest eingegliedert war" (p. 234). The contrary view was put independently by Zdeněk Fiala, "Vztah českého státu k německé říši do počátku 13. století," *Sborník historický*, 6 (1959), pp. 23–88, and then in his review of Wegener's "revanchist" book, *Československý časopis historický*, 8 (1960), pp. 176–85. A sound critique of both, as well as of the whole corpus of the tradition, has just been published by Hartmut Hoffmann, "Böhmen und das deutsche Reich im hohen Mittelalter," in the ominously titled *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands*, 18 (1969), pp. 1–62; he emphasizes the "symbiosis" of the two political units, as best and most enduringly expressed in Barbarossa's reorganization of the Reich. The duke/king of Bohemia became a "prince of the Reich," as did the margrave of Moravia and the bishop of Prague; in this way Bohemia and Moravia were fitted into the new feudalized polity based on the *Reichsfürstenstand*.

While Hilsch's book deals only with the relations between the Prague bishops and the Hohenstaufen, it makes a point similar to Hoffmann's. Bishops Daniel and Henry must be understood as *Reichsbischöfe*, seeking and winning a considerable independence of ducal control by their direct feudal ties with the German ruler. Culturally and politically they moved in the world of the Reich, and their impact on Bohemia was shaped thereby. Here Hilsch's most important contribution is to show Daniel's importance in creating this pattern. The effect is to compel a deeper understanding of, *inter alia*, the great advantage to Bohemia of her participation in the wide world of Barbarossa's Europe. But the major Czech historians, including the great Václav Novotný, have portrayed the same phenomena as a low point in Bohemia's history (p. 229); for they have valued autonomy higher than integration into a German-mediated West. Unless Central Europe is now on the threshold of a new era of brotherly love, connoisseurs of the subject under discussion can look forward to much more argument on both sides. One can only wonder what the picture would look like were the *Problemstellung* not cursed by what is today called relevance.

HOWARD KAMINSKY
University of Washington

THE ANABAPTISTS AND THE CZECH BRETHERN IN MORAVIA, 1526–1628: A STUDY OF ORIGINS AND CONTACTS. By *Jarold Knox Zeman*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1969. 407 pp. 70 Dutch guilders.

The long title of Professor Zeman's work indicates the highly complex issue with which this book is concerned. It seems, at first glance, to concentrate upon a rather narrow problem. There is above all the meeting of two specific sects, or churches, of the Reformation period of the sixteenth century (in this case Troeltsch's well-known differentiation between the two terms is not easily used). Here the problem is limited to a relatively small territory, the margraviate of Moravia. The groups dealt with show some particular similarities and differences which apparently led to peculiar attempts and expectations for at least temporarily very close relationships, at times even seeming to lead to a melting process, at others to sharp antagonism.

Zeman's task therefore was not an easy one, especially since the whole background had never been fully clarified. One reason (apart from geographical proximity) that the two religious groups seemed to have a special connection with each other was that at one time, around 1528, at least one branch of the Anabaptists apparently was willing to merge with the older church of the Czech Brethren. It seems, however, that there were even older relations, or at least close similarities derived especially from the early development of the Czech Brethren, which maintained some important characteristics in the so-called Minor Party. Two German church historians came out with emphasis on these similarities at the same time, in 1885 and 1886: Ludwig Keller (*Die Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien*) and Albrecht Ritschl (*Geschichte des Pietismus*, vol. 3). The specific, and in Keller's case even somewhat naïve, assumption regarding a direct influence of the earlier reform movements, including the Church of the Brethren, upon the Anabaptists can in this form hardly be maintained; and a considerable number of scholars, including Zeman's teacher F. Blanke, can see no roots or sources for the Anabaptists outside or before the growth of Anabaptism, as a development having arisen exclusively in Zurich. However, this sharp rejection of any other origin for Anabaptism except the one connected with Zwingli is not accepted so completely by all scholars who have recently showed some interest in the issue. Among them are George H. Williams in his decisive work *The Radical Reformation* (1962) and Torsten Bergsen in *Balthasar Hubmaier* (1961). Bergsen, in his subchapter "Das Täuferium und die mittelalterlichen Reform- und Ketzerbewegungen," said it was "probable that the Unity of Brethren indirectly promoted the origins of Anabaptism" (see pp. 23–25).

While this specific problem deserves serious study and receives it in Zeman's work, he is on firmer ground in concentrating on the various groups of the Anabaptist movement that, finding a refuge in Moravia, were bound to meet, in whatever form, the Czech reformed churches that were Hussite in origin. This, indeed, the author describes with the greatest exactitude. There is, it seems, hardly a single source, even the least important, that was not discovered and used in the most careful way. While this detailed description may perhaps appear to be overdone, at least to those who would have been satisfied with a general history of the main developments, the scholars especially interested in this field can only be grateful for such thoroughness. To quite some extent this is also true for the author's "Historical Topography" and the seven appendixes.

Of considerable value is the way in which Zeman has clarified some of the leading figures of both sides. Among the leaders of the Czech Brethren he describes not only Bishop Lukáš, whose personality has been well studied and presented earlier, but also Vavřinec Krasonický and especially Johann Zeising or Čížek, as well as the more radical (originally) but not long-lived Minor Party (Jan Kalenec) and the sect of the Habrovany Brethren (Jan Dubčaneký). On the Anabaptist side Zeman shows us the clear differences between the various groups in Moravia, among them the "Spiritual Anabaptists," especially at Ivančice under Christian Entfelder, as well as those groups that eventually turned into the Hutterites.

The most important of all the Anabaptist leaders in this historical context, however, was Balthasar Hubmaier and, secondarily, the Moravian-born Martin Göschl, who is, justifiably, carefully discussed here also. It is hardly necessary to defend the thorough treatment of Hubmaier, to whom a long chapter is devoted in relation to his time and work in Moravia. This chapter has added to our knowl-

edge even beyond the corresponding part contained in Bergsen's generally excellent monograph. Together with this work and the ninth chapter of Williams's *Radical Reformation* we can now claim to have a truly complete and convincing picture of this leading figure of the Radical Reformation, whereas until ten years ago we were mainly dependent on Loserth's inadequate work of 1893 (*Dr. Balthasar Hubmaier und die Anfänge der Wiedertaufe in Mähren*). While these contributions have been valuable, Zeman has also made it clear how great a gap existed between Hubmaier and his in some ways most important branch of the Anabaptists, the "Schwertler," of and around Mikulov (Nikolsburg), and the Czech Brethren, in its many places. Zeman is surely right in emphasizing that, even where the two main religious groups met, their relationship was essentially one of "peaceful coexistence," and that even a (probably temporary) intimate contact with the Brethren would have been limited to only one of the many and very different groups of Moravian Anabaptism. Yet the complicated and, in relation to earlier expectations, largely negative results of the two important religious developments have been presented in detailed and many-sided clarification by Zeman in this highly useful work.

FREDERICK G. HEYMANN
University of Calgary

THE KNIGHTS HOSPITALLERS IN POLAND AND LITHUANIA. By
Boleslaw B. Szczesniak. Studies in European History, 19. The Hague and
 Paris: Mouton, 1969. 106 pp. 28 Dutch guilders.

The tendentiousness of this tract is exceeded only by the technical carelessness demonstrated within it. The brief and scandalously polemical narrative of the Knights covers activities from their founding (ca. 1150) as the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem to their final dissolution as the Knights of Malta following the final partition of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In the course of that narrative the author manages systematically to anathematize every non-Polish nationality in Eastern Europe and all non-Catholics save the Jews, whose persecution at the hands of the Catholics in Poland was as conspicuous as their complete absence from this work.

Since this slim volume professes to be a "helpful source for further investigation," and as such directs the reader to various possibly fruitful archival collections as well as published documents, it must be noted that the Lithuanian Registry (*Litovskaia Metrika* or *Metryka Litewska*) is located not "in Leningrad" (p. 83), but in the Central State Archive of Ancient Acts (TsGADA) in Moscow. Other errors, typographical and grammatical in the main, abound on every page—an appalling editorial lapse. The bibliography includes no work published since 1960, ignoring two potentially useful books in particular, those of Jonathan Riley-Smith and Paweł Czerwiński.

This reviewer joins Professor Szczesniak in his call for further investigation of the Knights, for there is clearly a need for a scholarly monograph on this subject which at least strives for some degree of objectivity and which achieves a greater measure of technical accuracy.

KARL VON LOEWE
Rutgers University