

From a chronological perspective, the hoard is symptomatic of the pivotal role played by this region in the struggles for supremacy between Licinius and Maxentius in the last years of the first decade of the fourth century A.D. In combination with Čentur-A, the text of Anonymous Valesianus, inscriptions and archaeological finds (cf. H.J. Kellner, "Eine 'Kaiserfibel' des Maxentius," *Archaeologisches Korrespondenzblatt* 9 (1979) 209-11) a vision of sweeping military campaigns and a shifting of territory is brought vividly to mind. The result is a difficult historical jumble to resolve, with scholars relying upon incursions not depicted in the literature (cf. V. Picozzi, "Una campagna di Licinio contro Massenzio nel 310 non attestata dalle fonti letterarie," *Num Ant Clas* 5 (1976) 267-75) or denying such undocumented incursions. As such, Čentur-C, dated by the authors to the middle of A.D. 309, (as opposed to Čentur-A, which they date to mid-310) is a signpost for the chronology under consideration. It is indeed unfortunate that the entire hoard did not survive for its chronological implications.

Finally, the Čentur-C hoard is valuable for the numismatic evidence it brings under the scrutiny of scholarship. The size of the hoard, the wide distribution of its mint sources, the date of the hoard and implications intimated above, and a few new coin types all are of potential interest to the researcher. The authors have done an admirable job of publishing the hoard: weights, strike-axes, and plates are given along with a detailed catalog. The bi-lingual English-Slovenian text is a true help to Westerners, and is well-done. Errors are few (however, p. 25, read 20% unreduced folles from Thessalonica, not 30%.) In short, the authors are to be complimented on making this hoard available to scholarship in such a positive manner.

*Kenneth D. Ostrand, University of New Orleans*

Emidij Susič and Danilo Sedmak, *Tiha asimilacija; psihološki vidiki nacionalnega odtujevanja*. [= Slovenci v zamejstvu; Izdanje Slovenskega raziskovalnega inštituta v Trstu]. Trieste: Založništvo tržaškega tiska, 1983. 174 pp.

It is difficult to evaluate the merits of this book. One reason for this is that it is hard to decide to which genre of literature the book belongs and to whom it is addressed. It exhibits many traits of a propagandistic treatise; at the same time it contains some theoretical and empirical elements. I cannot claim any competence to review the book as an ideological tract; in fact, I do not know whether any competence outside of partisanship is relevant for that genre of writing. In any case, the authors do not PRESENT their study as a partisan tract but as a scholarly investigation. Thereby they no doubt willingly invite a review by the standards of social science. By such standards, I regret to say, the book suffers from very serious deficiencies. This is all the more regrettable because of the notable interest of the subject of the book, the many-faceted problems of ethnic identity of Slovenes in the Trieste region. Maintenance or loss of ethnic identity are, after all, not only a problem of some theoretical significance in several social sciences but also of great moral importance. I don't wish to be misunderstood. The problem with the book is NOT that the authors are *parti pris*; they have every right to be committed. But their personal commitments heavily encumber their scholarly performance. They have insuperable difficulties to define, investigate

and present the problem objectively. In fact, they have few findings to present. The reader's expectation to be offered empirical data is disappointed again and again. In their place he is offered ideological speculations which have an unfortunate tendency to be disguised as findings.

In the early chapters the authors start with textbook-definitions (on the whole of rather obscure origin) of the major concepts they intend to use in the study. To mention a few instances: they introduce the notion of power and authority as if Max Weber had never written on the topic and refer to Russell, of all people. More disturbingly, their views of modernization consist largely of (19th century) hand-me-down "Kulturkritik", with predictable consequences. They propound a peculiarly individualistic and voluntaristic view of ethnic identity, they hypostasize "society", on the one hand, the individual, "instinctive forces" and the like on the other. They continue with an attack on internationalism (because it results in "devaluation of small nations"), regionalism (because it subverts identification with larger entities), they praise the importance of the soil, offer peculiar views of the effects of matriarchy, compare the Slovenes of the Trieste region with American Indians and Palestinian Arabs, etc.. They seem to be unaware of the host of empirical studies on the links of modernization and personal identity. They have not acquainted themselves thoroughly with socialization theory and they seem to ignore most recent work on bilingualism, diglossia etc..

As to methods: The authors are highly defensive of the use of (partly) open-ended questionnaires and interviews. In view of the fact that they did not seem to have the means for a large-scale survey, they might have made the best of their predicament. Unfortunately, they failed to do so. They are apparently unaware of recent developments in "ethnographic" field studies, of "qualitative" (narrative) interviews, of procedures used in the elicitation and analysis of life histories, etc.. I, for one, would not be surprised if such methods were to produce as important information on ethnic identity as large-scale surveys. But in the present study we have neither the one nor the other.

All this is too bad. The research design (or to put it more modestly: the authors' ideas on how to approach the problem) is intelligent: the authors proposed to look at the INTERMEDIATE links between people possessing the kind of ethnic identity that is taken for granted, and people fully assimilated to another ethnic identity. One can only hope that the authors will make another effort to explore this important matter, using the same idea. But such an effort will have to be based on sound theoretical foundations and competent use of sophisticated qualitative methods. More importantly, it will need data rather than speculation.

*Thomas Luckmann, University of Constance*