

THE HABSBURG EMPIRE IN EUROPEAN AFFAIRS, 1814–1918. By *Barbara Jelavich*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969. viii, 190 pp. \$1.95, paper.

To cover in a small volume of some 170 pages the international relations of the Habsburg Empire in the last century of its existence within the social and political setting of the era is surely a tall order. To have filled it largely successfully is to the great credit of the author. Mrs. Jelavich's treatment is lucid. Her conclusions are well reasoned, though at points—as, for instance, the inevitability of not only the empire's doom but of its basic policies—debatable.

On the whole, Habsburg Eastern policy is better handled than its Western. Discussion of the German question during the revolution of 1848–49 and again in 1866 appears somewhat less than clear. Above all, one might wish also that concepts such as "alliance," "state," and "political autonomous units" had been defined. To cite just one example: the Three Emperors' League of 1873 and the Three Emperors' Alliance of 1881 are covered by the same terminology, though neither was a genuine alliance. Furthermore, an appendix listing and briefly defining the major treaty commitments of the monarchy would have been highly desirable.

As to specifics, the trialistic concept never pertained to a Slavic state but exclusively to a Southern Slav state concept within the confines of the empire. The notion that this idea was particularly close to the heir apparent, Francis Ferdinand, has been laid to rest by archival research. More important, the view that an expected future solution of the Southern Slav problem within the empire by the archduke represented a motivation for his assassination is highly controversial and not based on hard evidence. Neither can the chief of staff General Conrad be referred to as a "close friend" of the archduke.

Yet matters of this and similar kind do not invalidate by any means the far more weighty, positive features of the book. Many students of the overall history of the Habsburg monarchy will benefit from the perusal of this well-organized and stimulating survey.

ROBERT A. KANN
Rutgers University

DIE BISCHÖFE VON PRAG IN DER FRÜHEN STAUFERZEIT: IHRE STELLUNG ZWISCHEN REICHS- UND LANDESGEWALT VON DANIEL I. (1148–1167) BIS HEINRICH (1182–1197). By *Peter Hülsch*. Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum, vol. 22. Munich: Verlag Robert Lerche, 1969. 262 pp. DM 29.

Although this book is a valuable and honest piece of work, unprejudiced and based on a thorough study of the Czech as well as the German literature, it comes into the world bearing the curse of its forebears. The Collegium Carolinum is an organization of Sudeten-German scholars, seeking to recover by *Wissenschaft* what they lost by policy and war, and the general problem of the present work, the nature of the tie between medieval Bohemia and the Reich, has been the subject of endless scholarly controversy for reasons having little to do with scholarship. The Germans have wanted to justify one or another form of their control over all or part of Bohemia and Moravia; the Czechs have wanted to validate their autonomy, independence, or monopoly over the land. The most recent exchange was prompted by Wilhelm Wegener's *Böhmen/Mähren und das Reich im Hochmittelalter* (Cologne, 1959), arguing that the tie was not a merely vassalic relationship between the duke

(or king) of Bohemia and the German king (either as such or in his capacity as emperor), and that Bohemia was not merely parallel to the German realm in this sort of subordination to the emperor, but "dass Böhmen . . . in das deutsche *regnum* im staatsrechtlichen Sinne fest eingegliedert war" (p. 234). The contrary view was put independently by Zdeněk Fiala, "Vztah českého státu k německé říši do počátku 13. století," *Sborník historický*, 6 (1959), pp. 23–88, and then in his review of Wegener's "revanchist" book, *Československý časopis historický*, 8 (1960), pp. 176–85. A sound critique of both, as well as of the whole corpus of the tradition, has just been published by Hartmut Hoffmann, "Böhmen und das deutsche Reich im hohen Mittelalter," in the ominously titled *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands*, 18 (1969), pp. 1–62; he emphasizes the "symbiosis" of the two political units, as best and most enduringly expressed in Barbarossa's reorganization of the Reich. The duke/king of Bohemia became a "prince of the Reich," as did the margrave of Moravia and the bishop of Prague; in this way Bohemia and Moravia were fitted into the new feudalized polity based on the *Reichsfürstenstand*.

While Hilsch's book deals only with the relations between the Prague bishops and the Hohenstaufen, it makes a point similar to Hoffmann's. Bishops Daniel and Henry must be understood as *Reichsbischöfe*, seeking and winning a considerable independence of ducal control by their direct feudal ties with the German ruler. Culturally and politically they moved in the world of the Reich, and their impact on Bohemia was shaped thereby. Here Hilsch's most important contribution is to show Daniel's importance in creating this pattern. The effect is to compel a deeper understanding of, *inter alia*, the great advantage to Bohemia of her participation in the wide world of Barbarossa's Europe. But the major Czech historians, including the great Václav Novotný, have portrayed the same phenomena as a low point in Bohemia's history (p. 229); for they have valued autonomy higher than integration into a German-mediated West. Unless Central Europe is now on the threshold of a new era of brotherly love, connoisseurs of the subject under discussion can look forward to much more argument on both sides. One can only wonder what the picture would look like were the *Problemstellung* not cursed by what is today called relevance.

HOWARD KAMINSKY
University of Washington

THE ANABAPTISTS AND THE CZECH BRETHERN IN MORAVIA, 1526–1628: A STUDY OF ORIGINS AND CONTACTS. By *Jarold Knox Zeman*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1969. 407 pp. 70 Dutch guilders.

The long title of Professor Zeman's work indicates the highly complex issue with which this book is concerned. It seems, at first glance, to concentrate upon a rather narrow problem. There is above all the meeting of two specific sects, or churches, of the Reformation period of the sixteenth century (in this case Troeltsch's well-known differentiation between the two terms is not easily used). Here the problem is limited to a relatively small territory, the margraviate of Moravia. The groups dealt with show some particular similarities and differences which apparently led to peculiar attempts and expectations for at least temporarily very close relationships, at times even seeming to lead to a melting process, at others to sharp antagonism.