

CONSTANTINOPLE AND THE LATIN: THE FOREIGN POLICY OF ANDRONICUS II, 1282–1328. By *Angeliki E. Laiou*. Harvard Historical Studies, vol. 88. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972. xii, 390 pp. \$18.00.

There is no question about the scholarly qualities of this important tome, which was well conceived and executed. It is intended for both the Medieval Greek and the Medieval Latin World scholars as well as for the advanced student. The chronological period treated by this monograph is a complex one in Greek and Latin relations and Professor Laiou should be highly commended for making every effort to disentangle it. To be sure, this is a very detailed study to the point of tediousness, but it is worthy of the effort, for it illuminates several confused accounts of events, agreements, polemics, and alliances between the two antagonistic worlds and makes many corrections to errors of other scholars who have dealt with the later Byzantine world.

There is original material in several of the book's nine chapters. In chapter one, the author builds up the background of the book's protagonist, which facilitates the understanding of his behavior and policies while in office. The character of Andronikos was shaped to a great degree by the experiences in his early and youthful years under a domineering and powerful father. There are some very insightful comparisons between the two emperors—father and son. Psychohistorians may hasten to attribute the inability of Andronikos to cope with the empire's problems to the fact that he had been brought up as a weakling, trained for a career in scholarship and theology rather than leadership, under the shadow of an aggressive and unprincipled father. Professor Laiou rightly indicates that under the circumstances even more competent individuals may not have achieved as much.

The other eight chapters are devoted to Andronikos's foreign policy with the Northern Neighbors, the Turks in the East, and particularly with Western European states (Venice, Genoa, Aragon, the Catalans, the Angevins, and other Latin peoples) and the Papacy. The book vividly describes economic, religious, and social conditions, and concludes with a valuable essay on the sources.

Throughout the book Andronikos is treated very sympathetically but not uncritically. The author spares no effort and excludes no evidence which might rehabilitate the reputation of Andronikos, who has not fared well in Byzantine historiography until very recent years.

The originality of the volume, however, lies not so much in its nine comprehensive and rich chapters, as in the two appendixes which include (up to 1972) hitherto unpublished letters of Patriarch Athanasios I of Constantinople, Charles of Valois, and Catherine of Courtenay.

We cannot deny that Andronikos accomplished a great deal. His moderation, in his efforts to restore peace and unity in the Church and to uphold the religious creed of his Church, is well developed. The author convincingly refutes opinions which attributed to Andronikos an anti-Latin phobia, as a result of which he supposedly repudiated his father's policy toward Rome. However, notwithstanding the odds against the emperor and his acknowledged accomplishments, the question still remains in the mind of this reviewer: Even after Professor Laiou's book, does Andronikos deserve a better place in the long list of Byzantine emperors?

Two other important points emerge from this major study. First, the Byzantines much preferred diplomacy to war (Andronikos serves as a good example of this practice). Second, the book confirms the influence of Western ideas on political developments in the later Byzantine state.

Some minor critical observations: George Pachymeres as well as two versions of Athanasios's *vita* relate that the saintly patriarch was born in Adrianople—not in

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