
REVIEWS

THE BYZANTINE DIVINE LITURGY: HISTORY AND COMMENTARY.

By *Meletius Michael Solovey, O.S.B.M.* Translated by *Demetrius Emil Wysockansky, O.S.B.M.* Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1970. 346 pp. \$12.75.

Father Solovey's book was written in Ukrainian and first published in the Roman *Analecta* of the Basilian order (1964). The publication of an English translation will certainly be welcomed by the large number of Roman Catholics of the Eastern rite now living in America and using English as their language of study, and sometimes of prayer as well. It will also be read with profit by the Orthodox, for whom the Byzantine liturgy is a major vehicle of tradition and the standard expression of the church's "law of prayer." Finally, all scholars committed to Byzantine and Slavic studies will find in this book the first scholarly and historical treatment of the subject available in English.

After a first part devoted to the origins of Christian liturgy and the early development of the Byzantine rite, Father Solovey gives a systematic interpretation of the Eucharistic liturgy as it is used today in both the Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Ukrainian Eastern rite, giving occasional preference to certain usages adopted in the latter. In general, the author is well aware of the vast literature on this subject. He makes full use of the achievements of Russian prerevolutionary scholarship, and is frequently inspired by Archimandrite Kiprian's *Evkharistiia* (Paris, 1947). This openness to the work of Orthodox scholars on the part of an Eastern Catholic is in itself quite precious, and witnesses to a new and welcome ecumenical spirit.

The author's treatment of the question of the *Epiclesis* (pp. 271–86), whose theological importance he fully appreciates, is in sharp contrast to many earlier Roman Catholic attempts to reduce the Byzantine theology of the Eucharist to the narrow Tridentine and post-Tridentine Western concepts.

In some instances, however, Father Solovey shows a peculiar bias. For example, in writings about the liturgical *Trebnyk* (1629) of the famous metropolitan of Kiev, Peter Mohyla (or better Movila), he recognizes that the editor compared his text only "to a certain degree" (p. 62) with the ancient Slavonic manuscripts and with the Greek Euchologion, while he also introduced "improved" prayers, taking them from the "votive services of the [Latin] Missal" (p. 63). In fact, Mohyla's *Trebnyk*, and especially his rubrics, reflect a basic Latinization of the Byzantine rite, which influenced not only the Ukrainian but also the Moscovite practices. This is hardly recognized by the author, who misleadingly affirms that "the Mohylian editions were simply prohibited" in Moscow (p. 65). In fact, the major Mohylian innovations were integrated into the Moscovite editions—for example, the rite of penitence and many rubrics in the Eucharistic liturgy. It is common knowledge that in post-Petrine Russia, sacramental teaching was mostly patterned after the Latinizing ideas coming from the Mohylian academy and that the hierarchical posts were almost exclusively occupied by Ukrainian prelates trained in Kiev.

The book is a mine of bibliographical information, especially for publications

in Russian and Ukrainian. It lacks references to modern Rumanian and Greek works—for example to the very convenient critical edition of the Byzantine Eucharistic liturgies by P. Trembelas (Athens, 1935).

JOHN MEYENDORFF

St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary

RENAISSANCE INFLUENCES AND RELIGIOUS REFORMS IN RUSSIA: WESTERN AND POST-BYZANTINE IMPACTS ON CULTURE AND EDUCATION (16TH—17TH CENTURIES). By *William K. Medlin* and *Christos G. Patrinelis*. Études de philologie et d'histoire, 18. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1971. 180 pp. Paper.

Medlin and Patrinelis have attempted in this pamphlet-length study to explain the mechanics of the cultural change which came about in Muscovy and particularly in the Ukraine in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The introduction to this little work and its freewheeling, sometimes intriguing conclusion announce for the "new social science." In reality, however, the book is narrative and episodal. The biographies of Maxim the Greek and Peter Mohyla receive more attention than the social and economic forces which the chosen methodology would suggest shifted Rus' from "traditional forms of belief" to "rationality." While the book presents many theses, its main point appears to be that Rus' (i.e., the Ukraine and Muscovite Russia) was forced by historical conditions to choose from among three disparate frameworks for its future development: the Western, the neo-Byzantine, and the traditional Muscovite. The authors seem to feel that Rus' chose the middle way. But even the material they present makes a strong case for the neo-Byzantine cultural framework being very Westernized, given the European training of the Greeks who transmitted this *Weltanschauung* to the Ukraine. Nor did the traditional Muscovite ways of thought die out with the absorption of the Ukraine and the enthronement of its culture in Muscovy. It is precisely the traditional Muscovite mode which stultified the Westernized neo-Byzantine cultural framework in its new home. Russia did not choose, it synthesized, as the Ukraine had done earlier.

The authors have presented material little known in English, particularly on the Ukraine, and they have isolated some basic problems. But they have failed to solve them. Those interested in cultural influences on the East Slavs in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries will be better served by the opening chapters of the old work by K. Kharlampovich, *Malorossiiskoe vliianie na velikoruskuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn'* (1914), unfortunately missing from the massive bibliography of this study.

GEORGE P. MAJESKA

State University of New York, Buffalo

MUSCOVY: RUSSIA THROUGH FOREIGN EYES, 1553–1900. By *Francesca Wilson*. New York and Washington: Praeger Publishers, 1971. 328 pp. \$10.00.

For the historian of Russia, the accounts of Western travelers are attractive but dubious sources. They promise the immediacy of the eyewitness and the objectivity of the outsider combined in a convenient package of fact and interpretation. Yet