in part, to the subject matter. Poland had a more or less clearly defined history. The Yugoslav peoples, by contrast, belonged, historically, each to a different state structure and evolved in diverse cultural ambiences. This imposes special difficulties on the authors, and, as a consequence, the volume on Yugoslavia lacks the unity and the clear progression so evident in the work on Poland. The period covered extends from the earliest times to 1918, with two-thirds of the space devoted to the years after 1800. There are three nationalities to deal with, Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, with the fourth, the Macedonians, emerging more distinctly at a later stage. We are informed that the second volume, which will bring the story down to 1945, is in preparation.

It seems that the authors could not quite make up their minds as to whether they were producing a synthesis of Czech-Yugoslav relations or an encyclopedia on the subject. The quality of the work is unimpeachable but, alas, the study is overwhelming in the details with which it confronts the reader. It is awash with the names of people and places, and one suspects that even Czech and Slovak readers will have a hard time finding their bearings amid the surfeit of data. A comparison with *Češi a Poláci v minulosti* is quite illuminating. The latter is rigorously analytical. It does not limit itself to Czech-Polish contacts as the title might indicate. It identifies long-term movements and trends in Czech and Polish history separately, and then proceeds to most fruitful comparisons. In the volume on Czech-Yugoslav relations, the comparative aspect is neglected; and overall trends do not emerge clearly. However, it is a monumental effort filling many blanks that had previously existed and it will serve as a source of valuable information for many years.

Stanley Z. Pech
University of British Columbia

THE AUSTRIAN MIND: AN INTELLECTUAL AND SOCIAL HISTORY, 1848–1938. By *William M. Johnston.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976 [1972]. xvi, 515 pp. $23.75.

Austrian mind or Austrian minds? It is significant that the German translation of Mr. Johnston's work avoids the issue and retains only the subtitle. And yet it is an essential part of his argument that the ideas generated in the Habsburg Monarchy in this period shared important characteristics that distinguished them, at least in emphasis, from those of France, Germany, or the Anglo-Saxon world: "masters of both surfaces and depths, thinkers from Austria-Hungary devised the premises upon which our self-knowledge is built." A second characteristic is the urge to think holistically, to reduce the explanation of phenomena to a single proposition, or to a series of interconnected propositions, to see connections that others have not seen.

Mr. Johnston must have the capacity to eat libraries for breakfast. He covers not merely the German-speaking culture of Vienna, fed as it was by immigration, but the distinctive and original life of the mind in Hungary, the considerable literary and philosophical schools of Bohemia, and the idiosyncratic exclave of Trieste. It is therefore all the more surprising that he says virtually nothing of Czech culture: we learn of Bartók but not Janaček, Klimt but not Mucha, and of Masaryk only in passing.

A book of this scope is, inevitably, a Baedeker. It cannot afford to linger anywhere very long and this means that for some complex and familiar phenomena, such as psychoanalysis or Austro-Marxism, which obviously cannot be excluded, it is better to go elsewhere. But even for these one needs the Austrian context, which is the book's uniting theme. I find Mr. Johnston's social history, if anything, more convincing than his intellectual history, perhaps because he tries to prove less and sticks in the main to Vienna. Some of his best passages are on the dominance of etiquette and the playing out of roles ("insincerity but not hypocrisy"), the languid defeatism that

https://doi.org/10.2307/2494943 Published online by Cambridge University Press

coexisted in that "Capua of the spirit" beside the neurotic creativity, and the "democracy of style" that lasted much longer here than in Paris or London, affecting the arts, religion, popular festivals, and—he might have added—cuisine. (Why is there no chapter on gastronomy? Everyone knows that what really kept the empire together was goulash and Knödel.)

The defect of Mr. Johnston's Baedeker tour is that, unlike Baedeker, he does not discriminate. Some of his heroes have irrevocably changed the world of thought (and therefore of action); some, like Ernst Mach, were profound and influential even though later science has rejected their theories; but there were cranks, too, some harmless and some vicious, and somewhere in his five hundred pages Mr. Johnston ought to say so. If "Karl Kraus or Stefan Zweig would be astonished to learn that civilization has survived at all," it is small thanks to some of their neighbors. The ability to integrate thought is in itself neither good nor bad. Even those who agree that "thanks to a few Austrians sprinkled across North America and Great Britain, integrative thinking has not quite vanished" would not necessarily mention Michael Polanyi or Friedrich von Hayek in the same breath as Ernst Gombrich or Joseph Schumpeter.

The same lack of discrimination is evident when it comes to explaining rather than merely presenting these varied phenomena. There are plenty of excellent insights, not least on the benefits of rigorous classical education, however pedantic, in imparting linguistic and logical skills. But too often Mr. Johnston is "typically Austrian" (in Arthur Schnitzler's pejorative sense of the phrase) in selecting the most complicated and least plausible causation. Why should anyone suppose "that lower-middle class Viennese may have projected onto the kaftan-wearers of the Judengasse their own yearning for a simpler past" or that the levity of *Die Fledermaus* was "calculated to mask the disappointments of the liberal era"? If, "in a society, where every occurrence evoked a wish or an aversion and where every brush with officialdom ended in subterfuge, it was natural to postulate a zone of repressed memories to explain duplicity," why was psychoanalysis not developed in St. Petersburg or Naples? And is there any scientific evidence for asserting that "the Habsburg Empire harbored the world's most diverse gene pool," thereby favoring the breeding of both geniuses and misfits?

If Mr. Johnston has not succeeded entirely at his prodigious undertaking, if there are a few surprising omissions, too many summary treatments, and some unities of time and place more obvious to him than to your reviewer, one must nevertheless acknowledge that there is nothing quite like it in English or German as a guide to those who first presented as paradox what many suburban newspaper readers now regard as commonplace.

PETER PULZER
Christ Church, Oxford

MODERN HUNGARIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY. By *Steven Bela Vardy*. East European Monographs, 17. Boulder, Colo.: *East European Quarterly*, 1976. xii, 333 pp. $16.50. Distributed by Columbia University Press, New York.

Few studies of Hungarian historiography have been available to Western scholars, even to those who read Hungarian. Steven B. Vardy has now contributed largely to filling the gap with an able study of Hungarian historians and history writing in this century, down to the Communist seizure of power after World War II.

Following a survey of Hungarian historiography from its origins, Vardy turns to his main subject. The *Geistesgeschichte* school, linked with the name of Gyula Szekfü, occupies a central place, as the dominant orientation in the historical sciences in interwar Hungary. Vardy's treatment of it is judicious; while lauding its breadth of outlook and the liberation it represented from the sometimes mechanical procedures

https://doi.org/10.2307/2494943 Published online by Cambridge University Press