

heyday of "Young America," and as evidence of the growing influence of the slavery controversy upon foreign policy. Nevertheless, the reviewer found it strange — and indicative of the author's tendency to stress politics at the expense of the American diplomatic tradition — that no mention was made of the pertinent controversy surrounding the celebrated visit to the United States in 1793 of "Citizen" Edmund Genêt of France. Spencer might also have accorded greater significance to Secretary of State John Quincy Adams' role in cooling American passions for intervention and recognition during the Greek rebellion and Latin American wars for independence during the early 1820s. Given this diplomatic tradition of non-intervention, one feels that Kossuth would have failed in his quest even had the whirligig of domestic political strife not confronted him. In terms of the domestic context of Kossuth's failure, finally, one wonders whether the Garrisonian wing of the abolitionist movement was as important by 1850 as Spencer thinks. According to Aileen Kraditor, for example, Garrison's radicalism had made him a pariah, and the movement had gone beyond him, into politics. If so, the shrewd Kossuth should have worried less about offending the abolitionists than Spencer argues. These questions of emphasis, and a few typographical errors, in no way detract from the author's demonstration that in the person of Louis Kossuth "Young America" confronted its own image — and ultimately recoiled.

Queen's University

Geoffrey S. Smith

The Slovak National Awakening: An Essay in the Intellectual History of East Central Europe. By Peter Brock. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976. 104 pp. \$12.50.

Professor Brock's essay on the Slovak national awakening is a welcome and important contribution to Western writings on the Slovaks. The author has left very few stones unturned in his research, examining not only available primary sources, but also the broad spectrum of essays and studies mostly in Slovak, that have appeared inside and outside Czechoslovakia in the last half-century.

Professor Brock has not written a complete history of the Slovak national awakening, but rather, as he indicates in his preface and subtitle, an intellectual history. In a way this is a pity, for as a result his essay raises a number of questions on the role and importance of intellectual movements in a predominantly agrarian society. This is best

illustrated by the importance he gives to the Czechoslovak idea in the Slovak national awakening and in the development of the Slovak nation.

The first problem lies in the fact that the author does not define the Czechoslovak idea, nor does he attempt to dissociate it from the ideology of "Czechoslovakism" that the first Czechoslovak Republic had propagated. He writes: "The emergence of a Czechoslovak state in 1918 and its reinstatement in 1945 reflected the vitality of the Czechoslovak idea" (p. 36). From this the reader gets the impression that the Czechoslovak idea of Kollár and Šafárik (Brock uses the Czech rather than the Slovak version of this latter Slovak's name — an unfortunate and unscholarly usage) are directly linked with the ideology of the First Republic in both form and content. The ideology of Czechoslovakism was a Czech creation that arose out of a calculation made by the Czech elite that the Slovaks could and would be quickly assimilated, a calculation which they saw would also justify the creation of a centralized state which the Czechs would control and whose destiny would respond to Czech needs. Neither Šafárik nor Kollár suggested anything resembling this notion. Šafárik's Czechoslovak idea arose as a result of his being employed in Bohemia where he was under the influence of a few Czech intellectuals who argued for the unification of both nations in order to better withstand the centralizing tendencies of the Habsburg Monarchy. There are letters by Šafárik which refer to his unhappiness with this pressure which went against his earlier research and conclusions. Kollár on the other hand was more dedicated to the idea of the unification of the Czech and Slovak languages primarily on linguistic and religious grounds, namely the fact that Slovak Lutherans used Biblical Czech in their liturgy rather than the vernacular that the Catholics used. The fact that his writings were a mixture of both Czech and Slovak also militated against his accepting the decision of Štúr and his young generation to re-codify the Slovak language on the basis of central Slovak dialects. Kollár's Czechoslovak idea arose at a time when the whole of Slavdom was awakening and when in fact the notion of being a Slav seemed for a moment more important than the kind of Slav one was. His Czechoslovak idea was influenced as much by this notion as by the presence of the Kralice Bible in Lutheran liturgy. But ultimately the lack of understanding from the Czech side, about which Kollár and Šafárik complained and which Brock documents, indicated the fragility of the Czechoslovak idea and certainly its lack of link with the ideology of the First Republic.

The Czechoslovak idea was merely an alternative that in fact had little

hope of being adopted, especially in the final codification of the Slovak literary language. Bernolák's codification of the Slovak language in 1790 was based on more solid grounds; his problem was that he had chosen Western Slovak dialects rather than central ones as the basis for his codification and thus launched the debate of the 1830's and the 1840's. Štúr merely picked up from Bernolák's effort. The Czechoslovak idea was thus no more than a theme in an intellectuals' debate and decidedly not deserving the importance Brock has given it in this essay. Štúr's recodification of the Slovak language on the other hand was anchored in the linguistic reality of Slovak society.

Intellectual history is especially meaningful when it is set in the socio-economic context of the period. The debate over the Slovak language was important especially in view of the magyarization policy of Budapest. It was also important in terms of the language the Slovak people spoke. This is to a great extent adumbrated in this essay by Brock's emphasis on the Czechoslovak idea. Furthermore there is very little in the essay that sheds light on these problems; yet they were important if only because they rendered impossible any Czechoslovak linguistic and cultural unity. Count Zay's decision to magyarize the Lutheran Church in all of Hungary seems somewhat insufficient as the major explanation for Štúr abandoning the Czechoslovak idea to which he had temporarily adhered at first.

Kollár's and Šafárik's idea was resurrected after 1918 in Prague's attempts to put across the ideology of Czechoslovakism. It failed however to take root, especially among the overwhelming majority of Slovaks. And until 1939 the Slovaks were for the Czechoslovak Republic, but it was an allegiance that had little to do with the ideology of Czechoslovakism or with the Czechoslovak idea for that matter. Even ulterior developments point to the relative unimportance of that idea.

Professor Brock was however right to have examined the Czechoslovak idea as one of the themes in the debate during the Slovak national awakening. Not to have done so would have been wrong. It is unfortunate he chose to exaggerate its importance. Despite this, his essay, together with its excellent bibliography and extensive footnoting, should be received as a welcome scholarly contribution to East European history, particularly the history of national movements.

Glendon College, York University

Stanislav Kirschbaum

Hungary in Early 1848: The Constitutional Struggle Against Absolutism in Contemporary Eyes. By Edsel Walter Stroup. Foreword by Steven Bela Vardy. Buffalo, New York – Atlanta, Georgia: Hungarian Cultural Foundation, 1977.

“*Unmöglich*,” exclaimed General Hoffmann in 1918 at Brest-Litovsk on hearing Trotsky’s proposal of “neither war nor peace”; and the Hungarian-speaking reader of Mr. Stroup’s book is likely to cry “*hallatlan*” when he discovers that 1848 was not a turning point in Hungarian history, that rather than being a revolution it was a mere constitutional struggle against illegal Habsburg absolutism; that “thanks to the Hungarian nobility’s alert guardianship of the Constitution over many long and difficult decades, the 1848 demand for an independent and responsible Ministry under the Palatine was solidly based on law” (p. 125f) like the Golden Bull which according to the author was a manifestation of national consciousness; that the Magyar 1848 differed from its western counterpart in lacking intemperance and violence in mid-March. Professor Vardy, in his foreword, could not resist remarking, in all earnestness, that the reader “will *detect* the scholarly *effort*” (both emphases are mine) in Stroup’s work.

But in all fairness to the author, these theses are not entirely *unmöglich*. In the 1840’s Kossuth and his followers branded the rule of Vienna over Hungary illegitimate and blamed all the woes of Magyar-dom on Habsburg domination and misrule. The echoes of Kossuthite propaganda were last heard in the writings of Hungarian historians of the early 1950’s. Kossuth was rebuffed by Széchenyi who viewed the country’s Constitution not as a fortress of liberty but as a prison. Recent studies by G. Spira, J. Varga and I. Deák have contributed much to our understanding of the role of various social classes in the Revolution and the brilliant political maneuvers of Kossuth and his party while correcting the falsifications of the 50’s.

The very existence of the active Diet in Hungary in the *Vormärz* casts doubt on Stroup’s labelling of Vienna as absolutist. The impact of violence on the streets of Paris, Vienna, the constant threat of violence in Pozsony and Pest-Buda, the lingering ghosts of jacquerie in Galicia and Northern Hungary cannot easily be discounted and replaced by the image of a benevolent gentry and a peaceful constitutional deal between Austria and Hungary. Neither can one find national consciousness in Hungary before the reign of Joseph II or consider Hungary, regardless of the Law of 1790/X, “an independent kingdom.”

It is unfortunate that Stroup did not bother to counter the arguments