

The organization of the volume into several sections starting with "Bibliography" and ending with "Foreign Relations" is sensible and easy to follow. Three appendixes provide a fairly extensive list of journals, explain fifty most commonly used terms in Polish history, and give a list of geographical names. These three sections, however, are marred by some errors. Diacritical marks are used quite haphazardly, such terms as "województwo" and "królestwo" should not have been misspelled in the glossary, nor should the gazetteer contain a mistaken date concerning Galicia (p. 163). The periodicals section lists several insignificant local journals but omits *Z dziejów stosunków polsko-radzieckich*, *Studia i materiały z historii ZSRR i Europy środkowo-wschodniej*, *Niepodległość*, and *Western Affairs*.

Numerous misspellings of authors' names are also unfortunate. Who would guess that M. W. Gatske refers to H. W. Gatzke? Wiczerzak, Michałowski, and Kusielewicz appear in garbled form. There are other mistakes, for example, in item 0656 where the correct date is 1963 not 1967. Such errors are hard to forgive in a publication of this type. Thus, while warmly welcoming Davies's initiative, one can only hope that the next edition will eliminate all such errors and establish a higher standard of precision and reliability.

PIOTR S. WANDYCZ  
Yale University

#### ŠTÚDIE Z DEJÍN SVETOVEJ SLAVISTIKY DO POLOVICE 19. STOROČIA.

Edited by *Jozef Hrozičnik*. Bratislava: Veda, 1978. 510 pp.

The twenty articles in this collection represent an overview of the state of the art of Slavic studies, at least in Eastern Europe. Despite the wide range of subjects covered, the volume has a certain thematic and chronological unity. The authors are concerned with such broad questions as the origins of Slavic studies as a separate scholarly discipline and the emergence of the idea of Slavic reciprocity. Within this general context they review the development of Slavic studies in Russia and Eastern Europe and assess the contributions of individual scholars. Chronologically, most of the articles focus upon the period of national awakenings and of the Enlightenment, Romanticism, and liberalism between the latter decades of the eighteenth century and the revolution of 1848.

In an introductory article, V. A. D'iakov concludes that the idea of Slavic reciprocity and Slavic studies themselves grew out of the same political and economic conditions that had produced the national awakenings. The dependence of Slavic studies upon broad social changes is also effectively argued by Milan Kudělka, Zdeněk Šimeček, and Radoslav Večerka in their review of Czech Slavic studies. In particular, they refer to the evolution of ideas from the generation of the Enlightenment represented by Josef Dobrovský, with its universalist approach to Slavic languages and literatures, and the generation of Pavel Josef Šafařík, which adhered to the Romantic conception of a national language. Vladimír Matula makes a similar distinction between generations in his comparison of Ján Kollár's and L'udovít Štúr's ideas on Slavic reciprocity. He argues that Kollár's theory of the fundamental unity of the Slavic peoples had become outdated by the 1830s because of far-reaching social changes and the growth of national consciousness. More representative of the new stage in the evolution of the Slovak people was Štúr and the middle-class intellectuals, who, while accepting the idea of Slavic unity, at the same time recognized as inevitable the process of national differentiation already taking place within the Slavic family.

Another series of articles surveys the development of Slavic studies in various countries. In addition to the comprehensive piece on the Czechs mentioned above, there are two on the Slovaks. Ján Tibenský, who has written numerous stimulating works on Slovak national consciousness, traces the course of Slovak Slavic studies from the seventeenth to the beginning of the nineteenth century. He describes how

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-