

Overall, this is a valuable study which seeks to be objective under difficult conditions.

JOEL M. HALPERN

*University of Massachusetts, Amherst*

SPOLEČENSKÁ STRUKTURA A REVOLUCE. By *Jiří Houška*. Sociologická knižnice. Prague: Svoboda, 1974. 325 pp. Kčs. 28, paper.

The author is section head in the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, and the title suggests a theoretical analysis—in Marxist perspective, to be sure—of the interaction between social structure and revolution: how revolutions transform social institutions and how in turn social fabrics of various types promote or inhibit revolutionary change. Instead, we have before us a potpourri of well-known Marxist interpretations of the beginnings of industrial capitalism (without the brilliance characteristic of the founding fathers of “scientific socialism”), polemics against the “traps of idealist philosophy,” selected census data in support of the claims of the present socioeconomic regime in Czechoslovakia, and invectives against the general trend manifested in Czechoslovak social science during its rebirth in the 1960s.

This last aspect of the book is the most important. Houška attempts to settle accounts with the school of “creative Marxism” in Czechoslovak sociology, which supplied a vital contribution to the theoretical basis of what is now generally known as the “Prague Spring.” Anyone fairly well acquainted with Czechoslovak sociological literature of that period can easily recognize the precise targets of Houška criticism, and in many cases Houška names them. He also reserves a prominent place for one particular “heretical” work—the account of a remarkable survey of social differentiation and vertical mobility, carried out in the years 1966–67 among a representative sample of almost 35,000 households in Czechoslovakia (Pavel Machonin, ed., *Československá společnost*, Bratislava, 1969). Houška’s criticism is not surprising for the very nature of this research project is patently objectionable to Houška and his colleagues. A number of other publications of the same period may also be identified as objects of his criticism.

Houška obviously sets out to delineate the correct application of Marxism in the study of social change. The main question is, of course, what yardstick does he use to distinguish the correct application from the incorrect. In the introduction he states that, if “the new praxis does not confirm the assumed premises” of social theory, we must “correct, revise or even totally reject such premises.” This sounds very courageous, but, unfortunately, the author does not heed his own words.

ZDENEK SUDA

*University of Pittsburgh*

Z ČESKÉ LITERATURY A KULTURY (1860–1960). By *Zdeněk Nejedlý*. Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1972. 808 pp. Kčs. 45.

This book offers more than a selection of Nejedlý’s writings. It illustrates the growth of an ideology, and should be of interest to all who study the development of socialist realism. Zdeněk Nejedlý (1878–1962) was professor of musicology at Charles University and an intellectual who had an important influence on Czech cultural life in Austrian Bohemia, in the First Czechoslovak Republic, and in the

Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. The introduction by L. Štoll, official spokesman for Czechoslovak literary Marxism, is the publication's imprimatur.

The book is roughly divided into three sections: articles and essays related to the music of B. Smetana, those concerning the Czech classics of the nineteenth century, and, finally, those guided or influenced by Marxism. (Nejedlý's major scholarly work, his study on the Hussite song, is not included in the anthology.) The first essay, on Otakar Hostinský (1907), touches upon Smetana's music as do "Karel Sabina" (1908), and "Max Brod, Über die Schönheit hässlicher Bilder" (1915). It was Nejedlý who made popular Max Brod's comment: "Smetana made the Vltava flow in G major."

Nejedlý's partisan treatment of Czech classics includes Jirásek, Hálek, Rais, and others. However, Nejedlý's polemical tone has lost the sharp edge which it had at the turn of the century—when decadence and symbolism were at their peak. In the years following World War I, when new trends in art and literature were in full swing, Nejedlý's opinion of Alois Jirásek, a writer of popular historical novels, as the foremost Czech writer seemed to border on naïveté. After 1945, however, Nejedlý's innate conservative taste became the order of the day and he assumed the position of arbiter, comparable to Gorky's position in Russia.

The third section of the volume contains articles on prominent Czech scholars who were Nejedlý's contemporaries. The articles include an interesting contribution on the matter of Hanka's falsification of Czech medieval manuscripts (1906); portraits of J. Goll (1906), J. Gebauer (1907), F. Čáda (1918), and K. Krofta (1936); and later discussions of Communist Party members Julius Fučík (a writer) and Nezval and Wolker (both poets). In this section we are also exposed to the world of socialist realism and its policies. We find an essay praising *Optimisticheskaja tragediia* (1935), and a devastating criticism of Karel Čapek's *The Life of Insects* (1922). Čapek's obituary, however, written in 1938, praises his democratic attitude because in the late thirties Čapek was in good standing with Soviet Russia. In short, literary issues of the first half of the century in Czechoslovakia stand out with clarity and authenticity, and their relation to the development of socialist realism, as it grew out of the politico-cultural situation of Czech intellectual history, becomes apparent.

The book has an afterword by J. Dvořák and includes an excellent commentary and bibliography.

MILADA SOUČKOVÁ  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

STAATSVERWALTUNG UND KIRCHLICHE AUTORITÄT IM 18. JAHRHUNDERT: DAS PROBLEM DER ZENSUR IN DER THERESIANSCHEN REFORM. By *Grete Klingenstein*. Österreich Archiv. Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Österreichkunde. Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1970. 235 pp. DM 22, paper.

The focal point of Dr. Klingenstein's treatise, indicated by the subtitle, is introduced at length and embellished by a host of informative comments on the relation of church and state in early modern Austria. Using the issue of press censorship as an exemplary framework, the author examines in selective fashion the complex interweaving of ecclesiastic and secular authority from the Counter Reformation to the Josephinist epoch.