

This encyclopedia is intended not only for scholars but for the millions of Ukrainians living outside the homeland. Some features which may be most interesting for the latter make the work less attractive for the former. For example, in the "Ukrainians Abroad" section there are numerous discussions and illustrations of insignificant buildings (churches, schools, houses) and groups (choirs, drama groups, political meetings), suggestive of the nostalgia of an old college annual. Throughout the work the authors have taken care to mention as many contributors to the Ukrainian heritage as possible, with the result that long lists of names interfere with the narrative. In some cases, such as the list of fifty-one twentieth-century dramatists, it is possible with difficulty to separate the prominent from the obscure by referring to the additional information given. But for the thirty-five twentieth-century composers, the reader finds only a list of names, with dates and some compositions. There is seldom enough additional information to permit the reader to construct a simple biographical sketch of the "Who's Who" type.

One of the pitfalls of this format is that some important items, which would have been covered in alphabetical articles, escape the attention of the authors. The encyclopedia is noteworthy for its comprehensiveness, and this reviewer could seldom fault it on the Ukrainian *past*. However, some essential items relating to the last decade have been missed, either through faulty updating or because they did not fall into the purview of any essay. One cannot find simple biographical information in either volume on the recent Soviet Ukrainian leaders Shelest, Podgorny, or Kirichenko, although all were prominent by the time the first volume of this work appeared in 1963. There seems to be nothing about the current protest movement in the Ukraine or its leaders, such as Chornovil, Dzyuba, and Moroz. This storm has been brewing since 1965, and it is, to say the least, of vital interest to the readers of this work.

But these petty matters do not diminish the usefulness of the encyclopedia for scholars. The omissions are few, and the material intended for fellow Ukrainians is a small percentage of ballast which does not interfere with the general scholarly character of the work. This encyclopedia is a monument to the scholarship of Ukrainians living outside the homeland, and is an essential compendium of information for all who are interested in Ukrainian studies.

LOWELL TILLET
Wake Forest University

LUDOLF VON SAGAN UND SEINE STELLUNG IN DER AUSEINANDERSETZUNG UM KONZILIARISMUS UND HUSSITISMUS. By *Franz Machilek*. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität zu München. Wissenschaftliche Materialien und Beiträge zur Geschichte und Landeskunde der Böhmisches Länder, no. 8. Munich: Verlag Robert Lerche, 1967. 256 pp. DM 16, paper.

Dr. Machilek's publication is more than a dissertation, and we can only regret that it is overwhelmed with notes (about one-third of the whole) and that instead of being presented in the usual printed form it is typewritten and reduced to a size difficult to read. But the substance of the book is most valuable. We have recently gained a number of works on this subject, not only in Czech but also in German and English, as well as biographies of important figures who fought or contributed

to the development of Hussitism. There are, on the other hand, few contemporary works that clearly take the side of the Catholic Church against the Hussites as a heretical people. There were some important Catholics whose works we know, but they belonged to a slightly later period—for example, Enea Silvio, later Pope Pius II, or Jan Długosz of Cracow, both of whom wrote their attacks on Hussitism in the second half of the fifteenth century. On the period of the Hussite revolution we find few such important Catholic writers. In some cases—for example, Andrew of Brod or Simon of Tišnov, who returned from Hussitism to Catholicism—we have a limited knowledge of their sharp antagonism to the Hussite world. (We might also mention King Sigismund's personal secretary, Windecke, with his *Denkwürdigkeiten*, Thomas Ebendorfer's *Cronica Austrie*, and, to a lesser degree, the works of Andrew of Ratisbon.) But the most impressive of the fighters against Hussitism was the Abbot Ludolf of the Monastery of Sagan, at the border between Silesia and Lusatia.

Machilek deals first with the Great Schism. In relation to this dangerous religious sickness he also discusses Ludolf's ideas on the movement of Conciliarism. Among Ludolf's several works (some have been published in part) the most important is the "Tractatus de longevo schismate." Two parts of this document were published, with rather regrettable omissions, by the Austrian historian Johann Loserth in his *Beiträge zur Geschichte der husitischen Bewegung* (Archiv für österreichische Geschichte, no. 60, Vienna, 1880). This version is far from adequate but is, as Machilek writes, "im ganzen brauchbar"—on the whole usable.

Ludolf felt deeply, even before there was a clear reformatory movement, that the schism created a constant danger for the church, and he was certain that it would encourage the growth of heresy. Among the most important and in his view especially dangerous figures was King Wenceslas IV. (One of those who influenced Ludolf, and who suffered much from Wenceslas's policy, was Archbishop Jan of Jenstein, whose biography by Professor R. E. Weltsch has recently been published.)

Ludolf, mainly in the "Tractatus," presents a wealth of powerful and passionate arguments for Catholic traditions and shows an even more passionate hatred for the Hussite reform and for the revolutionary elements of the period. It is remarkable that this generally well-informed ecclesiastical leader (whose position as abbot belonged to the realm of Bohemia and who was an admirer of the strongly Bohemian ruler Charles IV) during the time of the growth of Hussitism claimed that the Bohemian people had lost their earlier values and deserved a correspondingly destructive punishment. The fact that King Sigismund, with all the possibilities he had, was never successful in the Crusades and the fact that he maintained close relations with some of the Czech lords (even though they were Catholics) made Ludolf wonder if the king had taken the side of the Hussites—a suspicion that was also expressed by other Germans. But Sigismund—whose breach of safe conduct in Constance had been a decisive factor in the burning of Jan Hus (and Jerome of Prague) at the stake—seems to have made it easy for Ludolf to defend him. One of the most bloodthirsty acts of which the king was accused by the Czechs—the burning of the Prague citizen Krása in Breslau—was fully defended by the abbot.

Also of considerable significance is Ludolf's fight against the "Four Articles of Prague," a basic charter without which Hussite reformation and revolution

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