

ETHNOLOGIA SLAVICA, vols. 1–5 (1969–1973). Universitas Comeniana Bratislavensis, Facultas Philosophica. Bratislava: Slovenské Pedagogické Nakladateľstvo, 1970–74. Vol. 1: 226 pp. Vol. 2: 301 pp. Vol. 3: 280 pp. Vol. 4: 289 pp. Vol. 5: 277 pp.

The Institute of Ethnology of Comenius University in Bratislava began publication of *Ethnologia Slavica* in 1969, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of Slovak National University. Bratislava's chair of Ethnography and Folklore is the oldest among the Czechoslovak universities so that it forms an appropriate locus for this new publishing venture. After its first five years, the time has come to evaluate the new series against its stated aims and within the broader context of general ethnology.

In the foreword to the first volume, the aims of the series are rather broadly circumscribed: (1) to create a periodical for Slavic ethnologists (it is the only international journal for this clientele so far), and (2) to broadcast the results of their research to non-Slavic ethnologists. In 1970, the aims were made somewhat more explicit: the major emphasis should be on comparative research among and between the various Slavic cultures, particularly on research which transcends regions and simple description. "Comparative" should be interpreted generously, and include relationships to the non-Slavic peoples of central and eastern Europe. The aims are realized by original articles, by a review and bibliographic section, and by occasional reports on scientific meetings and on the activities of the institutions concerned with Slavic ethnology. Since the series' inception, the editorship has been in the hands of Ján Podolák of Comenius University, assisted by an editorial board with members from the major centers of Slavic ethnology in the Eastern European republics. Five volumes have appeared so far (publication is annual). The language of publication is English, French, or German, with abstracts in the language of the authors.

The international character of the journal is easy to demonstrate after five years of publication. Although 34 of the 81 articles and reports published to date originate in Czechoslovakia (Bohemia and Moravia, 19; Slovakia, 15), the other peoples' republics are well represented: Bulgaria (10 articles), German Democratic Republic (2), Hungary (1), Poland (7), USSR (RSFSR [9], Ukraine [2]), and Yugoslavia (Croatia [2], Macedonia [1], Serbia [9], Slovenia [3]). Clearly, the major learning and research institutions have responded with articles, and the journal has provided an international forum for research in this discipline. At present, the editorial board consists only of Eastern European members and the journal has not yet opened its pages to scholars in the West. Hopefully, this situation will be remedied in future issues, making *Ethnologia Slavica* a truly international publication.

Among the languages of publication, German predominates (41 articles). The German, in general, is carefully edited, approximates native scientific usage, and is a pleasure to read. Articles in English and French, on the other hand, are not subjected to the same degree of editorial scrutiny. Frequently, the authors' (or the editor's or translator's) command of these languages is so poor that it seriously detracts from the content. For example: "This doesn't go the addition of thinking thinking that snahačestvo was existed only on the territory of southeast part of Serbia" (vol. 3, p. 175); or "In the lightening problem of originate and snahačestvo's contents several authors have paid their attention" (ibid). An international scholarly journal should not be guilty of such careless editing.

Twenty-one articles (25 percent of the total), as well as the review section, chronicle the activities of individuals, associations, and institutions. This emphasis on this topic is very useful to outsiders—they can rapidly familiarize themselves with the past and present of the discipline without consulting the widely dispersed specialist literature. For example, several chairs of Slavic ethnography at Eastern European universities discuss their past and present activities and their goals. Ten universities already have been featured in this way, including all the Czechoslovak and Polish ones. The issues have also contained reviews of the international mapping projects that involve material of interest to the discipline, and the First International Congress of Slavic Ethnologists has been abstracted. The review section is particularly helpful, for it surveys, on the average, the contents of ten journals per issue. This section could well be enlarged to include regional and local publications, in addition to the national ones. Libraries that receive *Ethnologia Slavica* undoubtedly receive other national publications but probably do not receive many of the smaller and more specialized publications. Thus, a content survey of these less accessible publications would be invaluable. The history of the discipline is treated in six articles which concern themselves with historically important figures (Erben, Kolberg, Niederle, and Šafárik) and some of their contributions to Slavic ethnography.

The remaining 60 articles also satisfy the stated editorial objectives: they deal with regional and interregional issues and they are broadly comparative in scope. Because the articles are supposedly chosen to broadcast the research products of Slavic ethnography to the non-Slavic audience, the present state of the field should become apparent if the articles are grouped by their contents. It is, of course, difficult to assign articles to unique, nonoverlapping categories. Nevertheless, the loose grouping given below should broadly and fairly reflect the major emphases and preoccupations of Slavic ethnography as the editorial board wants them to appear to the non-Slavic ethnologist: oral literature (14 articles); folk material culture (13); culture history (10); folk customs (8); folk social organization (6); research methodology (5); and features of Slavic folk culture elsewhere (4).

What then is the focus of the discipline as reflected in the pages of this journal? It may be easier to answer this question in relation to the preoccupations of Anglo-American ethnologists. How are the questions which are of central interest to the Anglo-American ethnologist dealt with? First, it is curious that social organization occupies a tertiary position among the topics covered. This strongly contrasts with Anglo-American ethnological publications where this topic would normally have clear preeminence over all other topics. Second, culture change and cultural evolution, the *raison d'être* of much American ethnological scholarship, do not figure importantly at all in the volumes under review. Third, economic variables (aside from folk material culture) and economic processes are not among the burning research issues in Slavic ethnography. This is altogether perplexing. Economics has always been one of the major focuses of Western ethnographic analysis (while material culture has been covered only marginally). Why is it that in societies where the official paradigms of scientific research are explicitly economic, economics ranks so low in research priority? Finally, modern and urban Slavic culture is the topic of only two articles: Fojtík and Skalníková's *A contribution to the theory of ethnographic study of contemporary folk-life* (vol. 5); and Musiat's *Sorbisches Gemeinschaftsleben im 20. Jahrhundert* (vol. 1). Only the former article touches upon some of the theoretical and methodo-

logical issues that have to be faced if modern and urban culture are to be investigated along with "folk culture," as understood by the practitioners.

"Folk culture" is the real focus of the journal and, by implication, of the profession. Customs, oral literature, features of social organization, and the material possessions of the Slavic village inhabitants of eastern and central Europe are given attention. This topical focus explains why the major emphases of the articles differ from those of Anglo-American ethnographic scholarship. For example, culture change and cultural evolution are of little interest given the data base circumscribed by the term "folk culture." Change that occurs in folk culture, as defined above, appears as a never ending decay process, as a process of devolution. As the differences between urban and village cultures disappear, village culture loses its interest for the ethnographer. The remaining data base is a disjointed assemblage of cultural features, that is, occasional survivals of isolated differences in the villages. These differences do not change directionally nor, given the perception of the Slavic ethnographer, do they evolve—they only disappear with time. Furthermore, the processes that bring about this decay are urban and modern, and thus outside the data base of the Slavic ethnographer. The processes do not need to be invoked or explained, for they fall within the purview of other social sciences.

Similarly, the data base perceived by the Slavic ethnographer is not likely to provide answers to broader questions of social organization and economic process, if "folk culture" itself is only a disjointed, steadily shrinking array of isolated survivals. Answers to these questions would imply reference to the population of entire villages, and to articulations of the villages with ongoing and evolving socio-economic systems, and thus, to a large extent, with variables which are shared between, or link, contemporary village and urban populations. Research on these questions would remove the Slavic ethnographer from his narrowly circumscribed subject matter and force him to look at exactly those variables (trade, markets, the economic and political order, and so forth) which are continuously eating away at his data base.

On the other hand, it is easy to see why cultural history forms such a central focus of the field (although only 10 articles explicitly deal with cultural history, most of the remaining articles implicitly involve culture history). If the present preserves only a steadily decreasing number of "folk" features, the past should offer an increasingly richer array—it might be possible to reach a stage in the very distant past for which a fully functioning cultural system of "folk culture" could be reconstructed. There is very little explicit expression of this ultimate aim in the articles under review, and even less discussion of the theoretical implications and methodological requirements that follow from it, aside from the (usually implicit) assumption that more data would make things easier, and that too much insistence on theory and a logically deductive research methodology would be premature until more (or all?) data are in.

Slavic ethnography, as reflected in these journal pages, clearly differs from ethnography as it is understood in the Anglo-American world today: in its conception of the data base, in research methodology, and in the theoretical structures that guide research. It is in regard to the latter two areas that the inclusion of articles (and members on the editorial board) from countries outside of eastern and central Europe would add important dimensions to the contents of the publication. Non-Slavic ethnographers, for their part, would benefit by adding this publication to their library shelves, if only to familiarize themselves with a rich, complex, and dynamic body of data against which general ethnological theory

could be, and should be, evaluated. The journal editors are to be congratulated for providing this international forum for Slavic ethnography and for bringing the aims and accomplishments of this discipline to the attention of the non-Slavic world.

H. MARTIN WOBST  
*University of Massachusetts, Amherst*

OBRAZOVANIE MOLDAVSKOI ASSR. By *Afanasii Vasil'evich Repida*. Kishinev: "Shtiintsa," 1974. 184 pp. 1.25 rubles.

Neither the style (somewhere between popular and academic), nor the content (typical Soviet characterization of a people's struggle to achieve national self-determination) of this work on the formation of the Moldavian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic is as important as its message. The book is unashamedly anti-Rumanian. Great attention is paid to Rumanian intervention in the Civil War, the Rumanian conquest and occupation of Bessarabia, and Rumania's constant refusal, until 1940, to return the area to the USSR. Of course, the Rumanians in question are bourgeois interwar Rumanians, and the author's tone is less aggressive than in some other books published recently in Moldavia, but the point seems to be that Rumanians are basically hostile to the aspirations of the Moldavian people and the Soviet Union in general. The very fact that the Soviet-held section of Moldavia became an autonomous republic in 1924, rather than a less important autonomous oblast (province), is attributed to the Politburo's desire to stress the territorial claim against Rumania while simultaneously allowing self-determination.

The author's conclusion that the area's economy greatly benefited because of the creation of the MASSR seems exaggerated, as is his assertion that its formation had a "huge revolutionary influence" on the toilers of Bulgaria, Italy, France, and England. However, one must agree that the MASSR aided the further development of Moldavian culture and national identity, served as a constant reminder to Rumania that the USSR wanted Bessarabia back, and encouraged a certain amount of antigovernment activity in Bessarabia.

EVERETT M. JACOBS  
*University of Sheffield*

DIE WEIZSÄCKER-PAPIERE, 1933–1950. Edited by *Leonidas E. Hill*. Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 1974. 684 pp.

A student of the Third Reich is likely to reach eagerly for this bulky edition of Weizsäcker's selected private papers. Brought to light from the family archives by Canadian historian Leonidas Hill, they not only present a unique view of events from an important vantage point, but they also promise to provide a more authentic picture of the man than either the official documents—which Weizsäcker often signed but had not authored—or the self-serving memoirs he wrote after the war as a convicted war criminal's *apologia pro vita sua*. Unfortunately, they do not deliver all that they promise.

The papers contain little of historical significance regarding the critical events the author witnessed at close range, as state secretary in the German Foreign Office