

of positivist history, he does not minimize the mystifications which sprang from its philosophical idealism and intuitive approach. And he rightly emphasizes its importance: the other interwar schools—many of them surprisingly robust—defined themselves in terms of their disagreements with Szekfü and his followers (whose influence, moreover, persists even to the present day).

Vardy analyzes the roots of the changing outlook of Hungarian historians in the vicissitudes of Hungarian society and in the shifting currents of European thought, and points out the political implications of the positions taken by Hungary's interwar historians. His notes are exceptionally full; the reader will find in them references to a broad spectrum of Hungarian historical writings. An appendix lists individually all the volumes in the several collections of historical sources published in Hungary during the dualist and interwar periods.

One looks forward to Vardy's full-scale study, now in progress, of Hungarian historiography in the nineteenth century, intended as a companion volume to the present work. At the same time, one hopes his labors will inspire others to make at least a start on the study of history writing in Hungary since the war. Vardy believes the subject is still too close in time to permit an objective analysis; nevertheless, Hungary's postwar historians have produced an ample—and at the same time very uneven—literature, and students of the subject could only benefit from a survey of it, however provisional, if done with the lucidity, thoroughness, and balance which mark Vardy's book.

RICHARD E. ALLEN
Columbia University

THE BRITISH IMAGE OF HUNGARY, 1865/1870. By *Tibor Frank*. Theses in English and American, Department of English, L. Eötvös University, Budapest. Budapest: L. Eötvös University, 1976. 375 pp. 20 Ft., paper.

This doctoral thesis offers the reader more than the title leads him to expect. The extras include clumsy expositions on the investigation of foreign relations and the methodology of public-opinion research, more colorful and readable, but only slightly more relevant, biographies of diplomats, and an analysis of Habsburg diplomatic services. It is only in the last third of his book that Frank delivers on his title's promise.

He maintains that the Habsburg Empire engrossed "but a small segment of British opinion" and that the general public received only "meagre information" about it (p. 239). Attitudes toward Hungary varied widely among the informed, from those who had "ultra pro-Hungarian" opinions to those who held "extreme panslavist views; violently hostile anti-Roumanian feelings coexist with wildly pro-Bohemian sentiments" (p. 243). Such diversity of opinion was natural in England, where freedom of expression reigned, but the author, understandably, does not make this point.

Frank holds that the British were not interested in central Europe, having their attention focused instead on their own imperial expansion. In regard to the Habsburg Empire their main concern was economic: they would have preferred a laissez-faire policy in the trade between Britain and Austria to the Habsburg system of protective tariffs. They welcomed the *Ausgleich* of 1867 mainly because it pacified Hungary, the largest element in the Habsburg Empire, thus strengthening the latter as a bulwark against Russia. The opponents of the settlement, above all Lajos Kossuth, were looked on askance, while proponents, such as Ferenc Deák, "the Hungarian Whig," were given a very good press. The British were more interested in Hungary's nationalities problem than in its social problems but favored political, social, and economic improvements in general.

The impressively broad scope of Frank's sources includes substantial archival material, contemporary journals and periodicals, and respectable secondary sources.

The English and the clarity of his style are quite good. The merits of his book completely outweigh such errors as his references to "Field Marshal" Lajos Benedek (pp. 96 and 352) and his contention that "recent studies" had revealed that the Hungarians who favored the *Ausgleich* wanted to conclude the compromise with the peoples of constitutional Austria rather than the empire itself (pp. 313–14). His clear and objective analysis of his title topic, his original research, and his presentation of it—all deserve warm commendation. Readers will be enriched by his book.

BÉLA K. KIRÁLY

Brooklyn College and Graduate School, CUNY

JURAJ KRIŽANIĆ (1618–1683), RUSSOPHILE AND ECUMENIC VISIONARY: A SYMPOSIUM. Edited by *Thomas Eekman* and *Ante Kadić*. Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 292. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1976. viii, 360 pp. 108 Dglds.

At the Fifth International Congress of Slavists held at Sofia in 1963 a substantial number of papers were devoted to the seventeenth-century Croatian priest Juraj Križanić. Encouraged by this fact, two of the scholars concerned, Thomas Eekman and Ante Kadić, decided to organize a publication dealing with Križanić's ideas, activities, and writings. The present volume is the result of their endeavors and it must be said at the outset that it is a major contribution to Križanić scholarship. That it has been so long delayed is no fault of the editors. Anyone who has organized a collective scholarly volume will have sympathy for their *cri de coeur* in the preface where they briefly touch on the delays and frustrations they have endured; they must be congratulated on their perseverance which has brought to fruition a most valuable work.

The thirteen studies included in the volume are grouped thematically. Two articles describe and comment on the previous scholarly literature on Križanić: J. Šidak deals with Croatian and Serbian contributions, A. L. Gol'dberg with those produced in Russia and the Soviet Union. With these we may group T. Eekman's concluding article. Eekman gives a perceptive appraisal of V. Jagić's biographical study, *Život i rad J. Križanića* (Zagreb, 1917), to which is added an account of Jagić's manuscript notes on Bezsonov's inadequate study of 1870, which have not previously been made known. The second section, dealing with Križanić's formative years, contains articles by A. Kadić on Križanić and Possevino, and by I. Golub on Križanić and his contemporaries. These articles set their subject in the intellectual context of his age. Golub's article is especially valuable in showing how Križanić's second stay in Rome (1651–58) influenced his intellectual development through contact with a variety of scholars with interests in such matters as the search for a universal language or a universal writing system and the encouragement of rapprochement between the Christian churches.

In the section on Križanić's ideology, A. Kadić gives an excellent survey of "the Slavic idea among the Croatian Baroque writers," and shows how Križanić's Slavophile ideas differed from those of his Ragusan and Dalmatian predecessors in their greater realism and lack of what Kadić calls "campanilism." A further article by Golub shows the strong ecclesiological elements that underlie much of Križanić's thought. C. Baron investigates Križanić's reaction to the account of Muscovy by Olearius; C. O'Brien and L. M. Morduhovič discuss his economic ideas in connection with those of Russian contemporaries, the latter author bringing out similarities between the economic notions of Križanić and Ivan Pososhkov; and A. Parry analyzes the Croatian thinker's views on Russian expansion into Siberia and relations with China.

Of great value are the two linguistic articles, by J. Hamm and V. M. du Feu. Hamm's article is the most definitive statement yet made on the accentual system of