

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."

Gerigk's analyses are generally competent, sometimes ingenious, and often stimulating. The analyses of Dostoevsky's "The Landlady," Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, and Pushkin's *The Captain's Daughter* may be singled out as particularly interesting. Nevertheless, it is difficult to escape the impression that these analyses would have been no worse without Gerigk's modern jargon or his existential-structuralist constructs.

VICTOR TERRAS  
Brown University

DOSTOEVSKY: REMINISCENCES. By *Anna Dostoevsky*. Translated and edited by *Beatrice Stillman*. Introduction by *Helen Muchnic*. New York: Liveright, W. W. Norton, 1975. xxxiv, 448 pp. \$12.50.

Anna Dostoevsky's *Reminiscences* provide a remarkable document. The very act of chronicling her fourteen years of marriage to Dostoevsky became her *raison d'être*. On the first page of her manuscript Anna Grigorievna declares that she writes in order to live: "I began to feel a great gap in my life which had to be filled with some interesting kind of work—otherwise, I felt, I would not live much longer." Later, she reveals that she also writes to "unriddle" her husband for herself. Apart from this personal impetus to portray Dostoevsky, she wanted to restore his somewhat tarnished image in the eyes of the public.

Unlike Dostoevsky's own works, these memoirs are filled with objects—that is, the cumbersome and comforting paraphernalia of domesticity. The reader can thus glimpse a new side of Dostoevsky—a father sitting up all night while his son plays with a toy sleigh, or a husband with a questionable sense of April Fool's humor, insisting (oddly recalling Svidrigailov) that there is a mouse in his bed. Out of this confined world of pawned, stolen, and stained overcoats, furnished apartments, trunks of manuscripts, and bundles hastily assembled at the sound of a distant fire alarm, emerges an affecting portrait of Dostoevsky and, increasingly, of his modest wife. Included in the book, of course, are the famous anecdotes about Dostoevsky's courtship of the young stenographer, his visits to the gambling tables, and his reestablishment of relations with Nekrasov. But the real impact of the *Reminiscences* comes from the accumulation of observed detail, from the passing scene which grips the reader unawares.

For those who cannot read Russian but who are interested in considerations of genre and form, this welcome translation of the *Reminiscences* facilitates a comparison with Anna Grigorievna's *Diaries*, written in the first years of her marriage and already available in English. Aside from the obvious differences between the two (in *Reminiscences* Anna Grigorievna avoids mention of Polina Suslova; she softens some gruesome details of their misery abroad, and so forth), other contrasts leap to mind—the different shape of experience immediately recorded and that recollected in comparative tranquillity, the need to unburden oneself of the trials of a particular day, and the all too human need to enlist the past, however gently, in the causes of the present.

While reading Anna Grigorievna's description of Dostoevsky's death and funeral one automatically longs for Dostoevsky's pen to portray these sometimes scandalous, yet moving scenes. Yet the reader soon realizes that Anna Grigorievna has quietly depicted all of them for us. Her account of the often painful comedy enacted around the writer's body (strangers crowding Dostoevsky's study to spend the night by his coffin, a count reading psalms, artists and photographers at work, Anna Grigorievna's hysteria for which she was mistakenly given a bottle of ammonia to drink, a barely averted catastrophe in which the widow and her children are nearly barred from the