

Mohammed Zaim. Several Turkish miniatures on the events are offered here as well. It is laudable that a chapter has been devoted to the reports of the recently deceased archaeologist László Papp, who, in the 1960s, explored the battlefield with exemplary thoroughness despite initial bureaucratic difficulties and disinterest. His findings shed new light on a few details which are important for reconstructing the events of August 29, 1526.

Allow me to add a kind of *Selbstanzeige*: the participants of a panel on Mohács, held at the 1976 annual convention of the AAASS, are presently preparing a volume of studies which will also contain English translations of some of the sources printed in this memorial volume. Although it will hardly match its appearance, it may be useful for those who do not read Hungarian, Latin, and Osmanli fluently.

JANOS M. BAK
University of British Columbia

THE METAMORPHOSIS OF A SOCIAL CLASS IN HUNGARY DURING THE REIGN OF YOUNG FRANZ JOSEPH. By *Peter I. Hidas*. East European Monographs, 26. Boulder, Colo.: *East European Quarterly*, 1977. xvi, 140 pp. \$12.00. Distributed by Columbia University Press, New York.

The title of this book is unfortunate, because the text never makes clear which social class underwent a special metamorphosis in Hungary. Rather, the text effectively demonstrates that society as a whole changed between 1849 and 1853, the period discussed in the book (a much briefer span, incidentally, than the reign of "Young" Francis Joseph). Problems of title aside, this is a well-documented, though greatly abbreviated, report concerning a few years of Hungarian and Habsburg domestic policy, complete with statistical tabulations and economic charts.

Earlier historians, the author maintains, tended to confuse the period of absolutist centralism (1853–60) with that of liberal centralism (1849–53), and they branded Prince Felix Schwarzenberg and Alexander Bach as sham liberals. Professor Hidas argues that Absolutist Centralists and Liberal Centralists were worlds apart and that, up to 1853, the Vienna-based Liberal Centralists governed the Monarchy—and Hungary in particular—according to enlightened principles. Far from being lost with the defeat of the revolutionaries in 1848–49, liberty flourished under such men as Schwarzenberg, Bach, Baron Philipp Kraus, and Count Leo Thun, all of whom respected the so-called Ocrotyed Constitution of March 1849, and did their best to unify and modernize the Monarchy in preparation for its ultimate political and economic union with Germany. The Liberal Centralists purged the sluggish Austrian bureaucracy and the undisciplined army, and strengthened those institutions, such as the municipalities, that were likely to assist in the work of modernization. The result was a number of significant administrative and juridical reforms, the reorganization of the economy, and the construction of many new railways, highways, waterways, banks, and factories; in brief, the beginnings of an industrial revolution even in relatively backward Hungary. Because of general prosperity, it is small wonder, the author explains, that most nationalities and social classes—including a large part of the formerly rebellious Hungarian nobility—supported the regime. Unfortunately for all, the Liberal Centralists gradually succumbed to the concerted attack of the absolutist emperor, the reactionary old regime bureaucrats, the obscurantist high clergy, and the anti-Centralist "Old Conservative" Hungarian aristocrats. By 1853, the Liberal Centralists had been defeated.

All this is intelligently presented, despite a few obscure chapters and debatable statements. It is hard to fathom from the text who the oft-cited Hungarian gentry were

and what their politics were. Moreover, the author, a great admirer of the Liberal Centralists, is a bit harsh on their enemies. It is simply not true that General Haynau's counterrevolutionary terror, ordered by the Liberal Centralists, was less brutal than Louis Kossuth's revolutionary terror (p. 9); nor does it make much sense to say that between 1849 and 1853, "chauvinism, a poison which Hungary could not overcome for a century, was adopted first by the gentry and then by almost all Magyars" (p. 79). Hungarian chauvinism predates 1849, but it was not more venomous than that of the other Central Europeans. The Hungarians were no angels, but nor was anyone else.

ISTVAN DEAK
Columbia University

DIE BAUERNABGEORDNETEN IM KONSTITUIERENDEN ÖSTERREICH-
ISCHEN REICHSTAG 1848-1849. By *Roman Rosdolsky*. Introduction by
Eduard März. Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung,
Materialien zur Arbeiterbewegung, 5. Vienna: Europaverlag, 1976. xiv, 234 pp.
Paper.

The revolution of 1848 in the Austrian empire produced the first modern parliament in the empire's history. One of the remarkable features of this body was the presence of a sizable contingent of peasant deputies. They numbered nearly 100, out of a total of 383 deputies, and, with their rough-and-ready ways, stood out in striking contrast to the polished parliamentarians who made up the bulk of the legislative body. Rosdolsky is the first historian to address himself to the overall question of the role of the peasant deputies in the Imperial Parliament during the 1848-49 era. He discusses the elections, follows the parliamentary debates concerning the abolition of serfdom, and analyzes the views of the peasant deputies. A valuable appendix lists all the deputies by province and nationality.

Rosdolsky's approach is that of a moderate Marxist. His volume is particularly strong on Polish, Ukrainian, and Austro-German peasants. He is superbly informed about the bewildering variety of manorial obligations and most illuminating about the infinite number of issues that parliament had to sort out before serfdom could be formally abolished. In a separate chapter, he offers a "close-up" of many deputies, using as a source the unique characterizing notes on individual deputies penned by Austrian officials; these notes are attached to the hitherto unpublished electoral acts. The author is less familiar with the South Slavic situation, and here some serious lapses occur. In relating the progress of the elections in Dalmatia and Istria, he appears to be unfamiliar with the ethnic structure of the two provinces: he refers to their population as consisting "mostly of Slovene peasantry"—hardly an adequate description of Dalmatia which was almost entirely Croatian-speaking (with a minority of Serbs), or of Istria which had three times as many Croats as Slovenes—and he makes no mention of Croats in either province. On the other hand, when he tackles the center of Slovene-speaking territory, the province of Carniola, he lumps it with Carinthia and Styria under the rubric of "Inner Austria," resulting in a loss of visibility for the Slovenes as a distinct ethnic group. No studies by Slovene historians have been consulted in this section, not even those written in German, such as the still indispensable *Die Slovenen und das Jahr 1848* by Apih (Vienna, 1896). In fact, for the South Slavs, Rosdolsky relies entirely on German sources.

As might be expected from the author's Marxist orientation, he has much to say on the shaping influence of class struggle in the countryside—an approach that supplies some good answers but at the same time restricts the historian's vision. He dwells