

which the Marxist-oriented East European states have applied the Soviet model to their own needs. He denies the utility of attempting to measure orthodoxy, being interested only in how the functions of Soviet-type institutions are performed elsewhere. He notes the variations between the extremes of Albania and Yugoslavia, but he finds a common core in the unique or dominant party and in the limitations placed by this party upon the freedom to disseminate ideas.

Lesage does not cut himself off from what is happening outside the Marxist-inspired world. He notes that administrative development is subject to the universally felt influence of technical progress. The task of leadership is what it is elsewhere—to maximize achievement and minimize cost while giving attention to the interests of citizens constantly pressing for an increase in the standard of living and a share in the decision-making process. The Marxian socialist variant on this world-wide theme is to be found in the historical experience through which the various Marxist-oriented states have passed, and the devotion the leadership still shows for its belief system based upon refinements of Marxist classical thought.

Lesage doubts that the pressures for an increased share in policy-making will result in any political change of note in the USSR, at least in the foreseeable future, but he expects evolution in other East European states. He thinks that their political and geographical proximity to Western Europe will cause their political structures to evolve more rapidly toward mass participation in government than will be the case in the USSR itself. To this he adds one important caveat: Soviet willingness to keep hands off.

This volume was written for a French public, not an American one. It will interest Americans primarily as a window on French scholarship and as an indication from a man with considerable influence that he intends to direct the oncoming generation of Slavists to think in more realistic terms than their predecessors of the benefits to be missed when studies are limited to legal formalities and essays in the realm of pure theory. As such it is an important milestone which Americans should not fail to note.

JOHN N. HAZARD
Columbia University

MORAVIA'S HISTORY RECONSIDERED: A REINTERPRETATION OF
MEDIÉVAL SOURCES. By *Imre Boba*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff,
1971. ix, 167 pp. \$6.50, paper.

Anyone who undertakes a study in depth of the ninth-century political and ecclesiastical history of Central Europe has to face the frustrations of confusing documentation. Written records may be at variance with tradition, and key sources may be contradictory or badly transmitted. This meaty monograph is an illustration of this complex. The author is no stranger to the problems of southern and western Slavdom. In 1967 he published his dissertation under the title *Nomads, Northmen and Slavs*, in which he presented some new and challenging views on several early aspects of the movements of the peoples of Eastern Europe.

The present monograph is in a sense a continuation of the earlier study, focusing attention on one of the rapidly changing entities of Central Europe: Moravia, or as it is also known, the Great Moravian Empire. Professor Boba is convinced that most if not all previous students of this area have been wrong in their approach to the subject in so vital a matter as political geography of the ninth century.

Moravia, he contends, was not situated north of the Danube and the Sava rivers but south, in *Pannonia orientalis* (p. 11). This is an interesting conjecture and gives ground for much of the rest of the book. One gets the impression that the author sets out to revise a number of assumptions upon which modern scholars have based their accounts. He claims that a true reading of the sources will show that Moravia was a city enclosed by a wall—a city well recognized as Morava by all the relevant documents. This geographical political conclusion is supported by the author with arguments based on new approaches to the sources. It should be remarked, at this point, that there is no map to make clear to the reader just what territory is involved and what the various delimitations of several layers of movement of people and boundaries precisely are. North, south, east, and west are troublesome terms in this area. The Danube changes direction several times and must be carefully used as an axis for orientation. The Middle Danube flows directly southward, the Upper Danube flows generally southeasterly, and turns sharply at Esztergom. Pannonia lay on both sides of the Middle Danube, and *ultra Danubium* was a confusing term which could mean either of two directions. It must be used with care.

A second aim of the study is concerned with the episcopacy of Methodius, the Apostle to the Slavs, in an effort to redefine the pattern of the lines of diocesan jurisdiction and the spread of the use of the Slavic liturgy. Here Boba opens himself to correction in a few details. He states categorically, "Methodius was not archbishop of a state Moravia without a fixed see, but, as required by canon law, a resident bishop of the city of Morava (or Marava), hence archbishop with some supervisory functions over other bishops in the realm. This is evident from his title: 'archiepiscopus sanctae ecclesiae Marabensis' (bishops are assigned to the church of an important city and not to a state)" (p. 11). The letter of Pope John VIII to Methodius, preserved in the Vatican Archives (Reg. 1, saec. xi), bears the rubric *Reverentissimo Methodio Archiepiscopo Pannoniensis ecclesie*. Pannonia was a territory, not a city. This differentiation is important to the argument, because the struggle was between jurisdictions—Byzantine, imperial, and ecclesiastical. There follows a detailed argument from the point of view of the Frankish chroniclers intended to locate the Moravians within Pannonia, which by now was crowded by the Hungarians from the south and east.

Something must have happened to change the native name for the land in the region of the Middle Danube and northern Morava rivers. It seems clear that the nomenclature has to be adjusted for the facts. Moravia and Moravians—as we know that territory today between Slovakia and Bohemia, a long way from Pannonia (roughly 200 kilometers)—were already recognized by Bohemian and Polish chroniclers. These sources have not been used by Boba. They should have been. He asserts flatly that "there is no evidence whatsoever that the Moravia of Sventopolk and Methodius was north of the Danube except for the fact, known from Frankish sources, that Bohemia was given to Sventopolk in 890" (p. 116). Helmold in his *Chronica Slavorum* states, "The Oder, the largest stream in the Slavic regions, rises in the depths of the forest of the Moravians who live in eastern Bohemia where the Elbe also has its source" (trans. Tschan, 1935, p. 48). There are many references in Cosmas's *Chronica Bohemorum* about the proximity of Moravia to Bohemia. In the introduction to his chronicle the Gallus Anonymus delimits the borders of Poland, starting from the north, "Poland is the northern sector of Slavdom, and has the following neighbors: to the east Rus', on the south

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 ISTORIOGRAFIJA 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