

the notions of "Slavic" and "Slovak" came to be differentiated and discusses the persistence of "Baroque historicism," a term he uses to characterize the fanciful, but widely accepted, theories of the ethnogenesis of the Slavs and Slovaks. Miroslav Laciok is concerned with philological studies by Slovaks before 1830.

The development of Slavic studies in Russia, beginning with the first scholarly attempts by Lomonosov and Tatishchev to explain the nature of Slavic history and culture and ending with the works of A. Kh. Vostokov and his students in the middle of the nineteenth century, is surveyed by A. S. Myl'nikov. He describes the relations between Russian and other Slavic scholars and attributes special importance to Vostokov's role in the creation of modern Slavic studies. In his survey of Polish Slavic studies up to 1848, Zdzisław Niedziela describes the crisis caused by growing hostility to Russia and by the divergences among the Slavs which were strikingly revealed at the Slav Congress in Prague. Viktor Kudělka calls attention to the two major, and contradictory, tendencies in Slavic studies among the Slovenes, Croatians, and Serbs—an interest in common ethnic, historical, and linguistic features that united them, on the one hand, and the cultivation of national individuality that tended to disrupt South Slavic unity, on the other. Hristo Purhev traces the efforts of Bulgarian grammarians, especially of Neofit Rilski and Ivan Bogorov, to create a Bulgarian literary language. Heinz Pohrt describes the development of Slavic studies in Germany from about 1770 to 1850, and Wilhelm Zeil recounts the early history of Sorbian studies in Germany.

A final category of articles deals with the work of individual scholars: Miloslav Krbec on Dobrovský as seen by his contemporaries, notably Johann von Ritterberg and František Palacký, and Karel Horálek and Pavel Krivský on the present state of Dobrovský studies; Věnceslava Bechyňová on Václav Durych's contributions to Slavic studies, especially his *Bibliotheca Slavica*; Karol Rosenbaum on Šafařík as a literary critic and historian, and Jozef Hrozičnik on Šafařík's major works as conscious contributions to the general Slavic revival; P. M. Tseitlin on Vostokov's contributions to Slavic philology; Stanisław Urbańczyk on Samuel B. Linde's career, with special attention to his monumental *Słownik języka polskiego*; I. V. Churkina on Bartholomaeus Kopitar's relations with Russian Slavists, especially with P. I. Köppen (to whose *Bibliograficheskie listy* Kopitar contributed articles on Slovene literature and language) and with Vostokov (for whose scholarship Kopitar had the highest regard). Finally, Jovan Kašić examines Vuk Karadžić's efforts to create a Serbian literary language.

Taken together, these articles present a comprehensive view of the cultural awakening and early national movements of the Slavs of Eastern Europe. Despite the emphasis on language and literature, they provide comprehensive insights into the world of ideas and the motivations of the intellectuals who led the political and cultural movements of their respective peoples in the 1830s and 1840s. The copious notes that accompany almost every article offer up-to-date bibliographic guides to their respective subjects, although references to Western works are generally absent. Students of nationalism and of comparative intellectual history will find much of interest in the volume.

KEITH HITCHINS

*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

REFORM KOMMUNISMUS: ZUR GESCHICHTE DER KOMMUNISTISCHEN PARTEI DER TSCHECHOSLOWAKEI. By Zdeněk Hejzlar. Cologne and Frankfurt: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1976. 479 pp. Paper.

Zdeněk Hejzlar's book can be considered an authoritative treatment of a crucial phase of communism. Because the author was an active participant as member of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee and head of the state broad-

casting system in 1968, he is able to review the inside history of the party after 1945 and also shed light on some obscure events during this period.

According to Hejzlar, what is usually referred to as the Prague Spring can be traced back to 1962, and the year 1968 can be seen simply as the culmination of a prolonged internal party struggle. The reform represented a coalition of two different tendencies, the technocratic and the humanistic. In the author's judgment the attempts to merge Czech democratic tradition with Stalinism (and later Brezhnevism) were doomed both in 1945–48 and in the 1960s by Soviet power, which the Czech leadership seriously underestimated. It was the Soviet embassy in Prague which initiated the famous letter asking for Soviet intervention early in August 1968. A group of Soviet and East German experts had begun meeting secretly in Dresden to plan the intervention as early as February of that year, and Ulbricht and the Soviet military urged intervention at that time. The Soviet political leadership was split on the matter, however, and made no move until assured that the United States would remain passive.

An interesting part of the narrative deals with the beginning of the "normalization" after the invasion. Reformers were still hoping to save some elements of the Prague Spring until early April 1969, when the Soviets issued another ultimatum. Until that time, Husák was still regarded as a moderate who sympathized with the reforms. It was then that he characterized the situation on his return from a meeting in Moscow as "We came, we saw, and we lost." From then on he made sure that Czechoslovakia would remain "Moscow's most reliable satellite." Hejzlar sees present trends as an attempt at a symbiosis of old bureaucratic and new technocratic tendencies. In his opinion, intensified ties between socialist and capitalist countries will speed this development. He also believes that the success of Eurocommunism in a West European country would work in the same direction, and that reform communism will inevitably reemerge, a conclusion not everyone will accept.

FRANK MUNK

Portland State University

PRAG 1968: SYSTEMVERÄNDERUNG UND SYSTEMVERTEIDIGUNG. By *Vladimír Horský*. Studien zur Friedensforschung, Forschungsstätte der Evangelischen Studiengemeinschaft, Heidelberg, vol. 14. Stuttgart and Munich: Ernst Klett Verlag and Kösel-Verlag, 1975. 534 pp. DM 25, paper.

An Anglo-American reader will not find it easy to digest Horský's lengthy book on the Prague Spring. On the technical side, his penchant for subdividing even small sections into still smaller ones, with standardized classification-type numbering (2.2.1.2. *Die Strategie der Interventen*, for example) leaves an impression of fragmentariness lingering in one's mind. Furthermore, the footnotes contain a great deal of additional comment and digression, not just references. There are literally hundreds of such particles of information. In a more substantive way, the genre crosses boundaries between history, political science, polemics, and ethical tract with greater ease than is normally the case, often landing in a no man's land which could perhaps best be described as historicopolitical psychology. Since the book has been written in German, however, it may find a readier response among kindred audiences.

The three main parts of the study are concerned with the Prague Spring, the invasion of August 1968, and alternatives to the confrontation—that is, courses of action which both Soviet and Czechoslovak leaders conceivably could have, or should have, taken when their respective policies reached the collision point. An appendix (in fact a fourth chapter) contains the author's rejection of the totalitarian approach to the study of Soviet-type states (his understanding of which is somewhat static, and his treatment of its proponents inadequate) and his own identification with the believers in the ability of these states to reform through the development of a "social-