

their viability, agricultural productivity, and the standard of living of overpopulated areas. With the political changes that followed World War II, the Communist governments saw fit to solve the problem of small farms by pressuring small farmers to join collective farms. This enabled these governments to choose, experiment, and change the size of agricultural production units as they saw fit, from one period to the other, in search of the "optimal size" for agricultural production units.

The author describes and analyzes the complex and painful process of change toward large-scale agriculture in Czechoslovakia throughout the postwar period. He draws extensively on the theoretical discussions and on evidence of the practical implications of larger farm size found in Czechoslovak economic literature. By providing various measurements of change toward large units, especially the recent concerted effort to build agro-industrial complexes on a very large scale of concentration, the author tries to assess the development of socialist agriculture critically in Czechoslovakia.

Bajaja attempts to relate the large size of farm units to agricultural productivity. His tentative finding, however, is that productivity levels of Czechoslovak farms are substantially lower than those of privately owned small-scale family farming in West European industrialized countries.

On the whole, this study provides useful information and analysis of socialization, integration, and the question of optimal size in Czechoslovak socialist agriculture. The important issues raised in this study indicate the urgent need for future research before questions of optimal size and the most efficient farm organization and ownership can be answered conclusively.

GREGOR LAZARCIK

*State University of New York at Geneseo*

LEOPOLD I OF AUSTRIA. By *John P. Spielman*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1977. 240 pp. + 16 pp. plates. \$14.95.

In this gracefully written little book, Spielman observes at the outset that the biography of any Habsburg emperor can be best understood within the framework of what he calls "the Habsburg dynastic enterprise." It is a thoroughly defensible premise and one that promises a great deal in any discussion of the life of Leopold I. From this stimulating beginning, however, the analysis rapidly turns into a conventional narrative in which the "life" of Leopold and his family disappears in the details of the "times." In part, this approach is unavoidable. Leopold's emperorship was taken up by some of the most dramatic moments in the history of the House of Habsburg, such as the Turkish siege of Vienna in 1683, as well as by his longstanding rivalry with Louis XIV, which gave rise to some of the most intricate diplomatic and military maneuvering of this or any other century. Nor is a straightforward description, in English, of the events of Leopold's reign without its uses. There is all too little material on the seventeenth-century Habsburg Empire available in English, and Spielman's presentation fills a genuine need. The chapters on questions of succession relate complex material with clarity and authority; those on bureaucratic infighting at the seventeenth-century Habsburg Court are interesting and necessary to explain the rule of a man so little given to personal initiative as was Leopold.

What Spielman has not done is to quarry the enormous amount of Habsburg family correspondence available in Vienna and Simancas which would have given him more of the material necessary for carrying out the dynastic study to which he refers in his introductory chapter. Leopold's handwriting has baffled even the most resourceful archivists, and one can well sympathize with an author who does not want to mire himself in such an endeavor. Nevertheless, there are five archival references in the

footnotes, and one wonders why Spielman did not carry this work somewhat further. It would have given his book a richer texture than it now has, drawn as it is from standard secondary sources and published materials.

Although Spielman has a good grasp of the seventeenth century, his knowledge of other periods of Habsburg history is not as solid, leading to both judgmental and factual mistakes in his introductory chapter. Louis of Hungary, who died at Mohács in 1526, is described as the son of the last Jagellonian king of Bohemia and Hungary when Louis himself was the very last king. Ferdinand I is presented as less willing to compromise in matters of faith than was his brother, Charles V. Yet, it was Ferdinand who engineered the Peace of Augsburg in 1555 which, with its famous *cuius regio eius religio* formula, aroused the wrath of Pope Paul IV and sealed Charles's decision to resign as emperor rather than sanction the existence of Lutheranism. Moreover, the manuscript would have been better had it been read by someone who knew Hungarian. Spielman uses the Magyar forms of given names, such as "Ferenc" for "Francis," but occasionally slips up, as, for example, when he calls the aforementioned Louis "Ladislás" instead of "Lajos." On page 64, "István" collides with its English equivalent "Steven" and emerges as "Stevan." The victim of this error, István Bocskay, who participated in a 1670 uprising in Hungary against Habsburg rule, also has his last name appear as "Bockskay." There is also some confusion between old and new Hungarian orthography; for example, on page 84 we find the seventeenth-century Magyar raiders from Turkey into Habsburg Hungary written with the modern spelling "kuruc," and on page 94, the plural of the word appears with a "cz" instead of the simple "c." The plural is also misspelled as "kuruczók" rather than "kuruczok."

PAULA SUTTER FICHTNER  
Brooklyn College, CUNY

MOHÁCS EMLÉKEZETE. Selected and edited by *Károly Kiss* and *Tamás Katona*. Budapest: Magyar Helikon, 1976. 275 pp. Illus. 120 Ft.

The four-hundred-fiftieth anniversary of the epochal battle near Mohács, an event generally reckoned as signaling the end of the medieval kingdom of Hungary, has triggered a number of topical publications, and the present volume is the most ambitious and most elegantly produced of all. Its 16,550 copies were sold out within a few weeks of publication. Other best sellers which appeared during the anniversary year included collections of articles reflecting the heated debates on the alternatives Hungary may have had in the decades before and after the battle. Thus far, the best summary of recent research is the volume by Ferenc Szakály (*A mohácsi csata* [Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976]), recommended as additional reading by the editors of this *Prachtwerk*. Important papers were presented at a conference in August 1976 which will also be published sooner or later.

The volume under review, containing written and pictorial sources, offers nothing new for students of the period, but presents material in Hungarian that was not easily available in such a handy and beautiful collection. It opens with four major reports on the events of 1526 by contemporary Hungarian authors (Brodarić, Verančić, Szerémi, and Istvánffy), augmented by letters of King Louis II and Paul Tomori, the commander in chief, about preparations for the battle and the meet. In the second chapter dispatches from the Venetian ambassador and the papal nuncio represent the views of Western observers; the Hungarian translation of a *Zeitung* and a Czech historical song (printed here for the first time) are appended to this material. The Ottoman sources include selections of J. Thúry's old translations of the diary of Sultan Suleiman and the histories of Kemalpashazadeh, Lufti Pasha Ferdi, Jelalzadeh Mustafa, and Kiatib