

Androussa of Peloponnesos as stated in Sphrantzes and Laiou. There is an inconsistency in the spelling of Greek names (some gross typographical errors in the Greek are also found on the book jacket). Why Arsenius, Alexius, Demetrius, Miletus, Andronicus, Nicephorus, while elsewhere we read of Athanasios, Autorianos, Apokaukos, Philanthropenos, Theoleptos, and so forth? I, too, have been guilty of such inconsistencies, but perhaps it is time that Byzantine and Western historians decide once and for all to retain the original Greek rather than the Latinized form of proper and place names.

But these are minor blemishes which in no way diminish the value of this exemplary volume. The author has made excellent use of primary sources as well as of secondary works and has produced a synthesis that will retain its worth for many years to come.

DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS  
*Stockton State College*

ECCLESIASTICAL UNIFICATION: A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK TOGETHER WITH CASE STUDIES FROM THE HISTORY OF LATIN-BYZANTINE RELATIONS. By *Josef Macha, S.J.* *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 198. Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1974. xii, 388 pp. L. 11.000, paper.

This is a curious work, in that its neat circular logic gives it the resemblance of a deductive scholastic exercise. It deals with the phenomenon of ecclesiastical unification in accordance with a preconceived historico-sociological scheme (its exposition consumes one-fifth of the text). Theses are proposed, a body of information is submitted in support, and the original propositions are proved valid. The conceptual tools are borrowed from Amitai Etzioni's various studies on organizations and political unifications. While certain universal axioms and analogies are drawn, essentially two "case studies" are considered: the Union of Florence (1439) and the Union of Brest (1596), with the emphasis on the latter.

There is much merit in this study. The author, a Jesuit, is scrupulously objective in his treatment of a subject which still arouses partisanship; his command of the sources is adequately balanced; his analysis of the course of the Union is rich in detail; and he skillfully summarizes the inherent theological, ritualistic, intellectual, and psychological differences between the Latin West and the Orthodox East. He also correctly concludes that the Union of Brest, albeit an "elitist (bishops') union," was prompted by the wider aspirations of the Ruthenians (Ukrainians and Byelorussians) for political, social, economic, and cultural equity within the increasingly oppressive Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

The shortcomings, however, are equally manifest. The prevalent historical and sociological complexities which guide this study are not always successfully reconciled, resulting in certain hybrid artificiality. Given the obvious conflict of the sources, an interpretative approach would render better results. Instead, there is a large corpus of seemingly unrelated and trivial information, often aggravated by tortuous rhetoric. Indeed, the book is haunted by poor editing, as it abounds in typographical errors. There are inconsistencies in the transliteration of proper names ("Kiev" and "Kiew," "Shumlansky" and "Szumlanski," and so forth), although there is a genuine effort to avoid offending national sensibilities (thus "Lviv" rather than "Lvov"). More serious, however, are the conscious or inadvertent omissions and questionable generalizations. Thus, Prince Constantine Ostrozhkyi's ambivalent attitude toward union is not properly clarified; the precise motives of the Zaporozhian Cossacks' violent opposition

to Catholicism are largely neglected; and Moscow, which played a major role in the ecclesiastical conflict, receives only cursory treatment. One would like some information on the activities of the Terekhtemyriv Monastery, an important center of Orthodox resistance, but none is provided. There is insufficient data on Petro Mohyla's apparent uncanonical elevation to the Orthodox metropolitan see of Kiev. Very little is said about his spectacular attempt to create a "Ruthenian Patriarchate," which would have reunited the equally beleaguered Greek Catholic and Orthodox churches. No light is shed on the alleged conflict between the Jesuits and the Greek Catholic hierarchy. There is a suggestion of a conspiracy involving Constantinople, Moscow, and Kiev in the renewal of the Orthodox metropolitanate in 1620, but no evidence is given, aside from a footnote reference to a Polish scholar (the scholarly consensus is that the Patriarch Theophanes was most reluctant to make the concession). Finally, it is often stated that the Orthodox hierarchy resisted union "out of fidelity to Constantinople." This requires clarification, since ample evidence exists that this "fidelity" was marginal, mostly an expediency. Nominal subordination to a distant and powerless ecumenical patriarch allowed considerable autonomy to the bishops, who traditionally resented patriarchal meddling in their respective sees.

Still, this is a useful summary of a complex and emotional subject, particularly since ecumenism once again appears as an attractive possibility.

ALEXANDER SYDORENKO  
Arkansas State University

ENTWURF EINER THEORIE DES LITERARISCHEN GEBILDES. By *Horst-Jürgen Gerigk*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1975. xii, 216 pp. DM 68.

It is difficult to assess the positive achievements of this interesting book. Certainly, many of its theoretical positions amount to no more than assigning new terms to familiar concepts, although the same can be said of some works which have definitely advanced scholarship. Gerigk's division of literary structures into those with natural and those with artificial "weightedness" (*Lastigkeit*) addresses itself essentially to the same criterion as the basic discrimination of Russian Formalism, *literaturnost'*. Another key concept—the "whatabout of the structure" (*das Worumwillen des Gebildes*)—is close to what organicist critics have called the "idea" (in Russian usually *tvorcheskaja ideia*). In general, Gerigk's conception is pragmatic and eclectic: phenomenologist, existentialist, formalist, organicist, and structuralist ideas are combined and adapted to the exigencies of practical literary analysis. While no elegant or even consistent system results, a pattern of functional discriminations does emerge, that seems to guide Gerigk rather well in his analyses of various works—mostly of Russian literature—which take up most of his book.

Gerigk's main concern is to avoid the trap of historicist relativism which would make the content of any work of art a function of its reception. Accordingly, he postulates that a work of art (qua work of art, that is) requires no commentary and coins the term *Kommentarunbedürftigkeit des Kunstwerks* to designate this phenomenon. These efforts seem to clash with his equally energetic effort to establish the "anthropological premise" of a given work of art (defined on page 11 as the "truth of the world of the structure"), thus building a bridge to the "extrafictional region."