

Hungary, on the southeast Moravia and Czechy, on the west Denmark and Saxony. . . ." Dalimil, writing about 1325, in his Czech rhymed *Kronika*, makes two interesting remarks: "Svatopluk, Moravian king and Methodius Archbishop of Velehrad was a Rus'." Velehrad was a considerable distance north of the Danube, since known as Staré Město. Czech and Slovak archaeologists and philologists have been making fruitful discoveries in recent years, and yet many unsolved puzzles remain. Boba has a low opinion of the attempts to make some consistent picture of these *reliquiae*. Time will be needed to allow for the absorption of the results. Excavations continue.

Boba has made a great effort to sketch a revision of accepted conclusions on many aspects of the question of the topography and politics of ninth-century Slavdom in its westward push. It remains to be seen how this revision fares in the judgment of others in the same field. *Audiatur altera pars*.

S. HARRISON THOMSON  
University of Colorado

SOVETSKAIA ISTORIOGRAFIIA LATVIL. By *A. K. Biron* [*Birons*] and *V. V. Doroshenko*. Riga: "Zinatne," 1970. 498 pp. 2.61 rubles.

This study is an expanded Russian translation of a work first published in Latvian in 1966. By two well-known Soviet Latvian historians, it is the first major assessment of Soviet Latvian historiography written in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. It would, however, be an error to date Latvian Marxist-Leninist historiography from the establishment of the Latvian Soviet republic. According to the authors, Latvian Marxist-Leninist historiography originated during the twenties and thirties among the sizable group of Latvian exiles in Russia who had fled from the Latvian bourgeois republic at the end of the Civil War. The main contribution of this early phase of Soviet Latvian historiography was the publication of document collections about the revolutionary era in Latvia and the accumulation of memoir literature from participants in the Revolution, such as the memoirs of the noted Latvian Communist P. Stucka and of the erstwhile commander of the Red Army, and Trotsky's protégé, General J. Vacietis. This phase of Soviet Latvian historiography was interrupted, as the authors put it, by "unlawful repressions" in the late 1930s.

The authors divide the post-World War II period into pre- and post-Twentieth Congress phases. The first phase is several times characterized as flawed because of the influences of the "cult of personality." Only since 1956, the authors seem to suggest, has Soviet Latvian history come into its own. The reader will learn about the quantitative aspects of Soviet Latvian historiography, but for the most part this study is devoid of qualitative judgments.

Considering that the Latvian Soviet republic has been an operative entity only since 1945, the amount of work accomplished by its historians is astonishingly large, even if from the interpretive point of view it is not particularly varied. The authors have divided the book into five chapters: "The Pre-Capitalist Period," "The Capitalist Period," "The Period of the Great Socialist Revolution," "The Period of Bourgeois Latvia, 1920-1940," and "The Socialist Period" (since 1945). One gets the impression that the authors believe that Soviet historians have performed best in writing on the earlier periods of study and that the greatest number of contributions have been about the revolutionary era. This would roughly correspond

to the writing that has been done under the stewardships of the late J. Zutis, a distinguished scholar, and J. Krastins, laureate of the Lenin Prize, who has guided the studies on the Revolution. The book is noteworthy for its oblique and delicate criticisms of Krastins's contributions. On the whole, this monograph is perhaps most valuable as a quick bibliographical guide to Soviet Latvian historiography, although one could also consult it for an assessment of historical scholarship in Latvia and the Soviet Union at large.

ANDREW EZERGAILIS  
*Ithaca College*

UKRAINE: A CONCISE ENCYCLOPAEDIA, vol. 2. Prepared by the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Edited by *Volodymyr Kubijovyč*. Foreword by *Ernest J. Simmons*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971. xliii, 1,394 pp. \$60.00. Published for the Ukrainian National Association. Also available on Microfiche.

This is the second and concluding volume of the encyclopedia prepared by the Shevchenko Scientific Society, based on the three-volume *Entsyklopediia Ukraïnoznavstva* (1949–52). Nearly a hundred Ukrainian scholars have supplemented and updated this material, producing a comprehensive library of information about the Ukraine in English. The completed work consists of twenty-one essays on broad subject fields (thirteen in this volume), with access to specific information facilitated by detailed tables of contents and indexes. The value of the work is enhanced by the extensive bibliographies which include Soviet works, by the numerous illustrations and maps in color, and by the up-to-date charts and graphs.

The editor's introductory statement that this work emphasizes "essential facts rather than interpretation" has generally been realized. The authors have approached controversial and emotional matters with admirable scholarly detachment, making their work far more valuable than its Soviet counterpart in English, *Soviet Ukraine* (Kiev, 1969), which was no doubt produced as an answer to the first volume of this encyclopedia.

Several of the essays in this volume are nearly book length and can be read in their own right as surveys of a subject. Essays on "The Ukrainian Church," "The Law," "National Economy," and "Ukrainians Abroad" are as comprehensive and authoritative as one can find. The somewhat shorter essays on "The Arts," "Music and Choreography," and "Theater and Cinema" constitute a detailed survey of Ukrainian culture.

In reality this is an encyclopedia about the Ukrainian people, widely separated and politically divided, and not about a geographical area. To read its pages is to be made aware of the tragic fragmentation of that nation in modern times. Nevertheless, the authors consistently treat the Ukraine as a distinct entity. This means that a given subject is subdivided in different historical periods in Russian, Polish, and Austro-Hungarian lands, not to mention the world-wide Ukrainian diaspora. This fragmentation becomes most hopeless in the section "The Armed Forces," which describes the actions of Ukrainians in this century in a dozen armies, sometimes on both sides of the same battle. Under such circumstances, is there any such entity as "the armed forces" of the Ukraine? One may get from some of these accounts an illusion of greater unity among Ukrainians than really exists, and a blurred picture of the Soviet Ukraine in the framework of Eastern Europe.