

ance of religious organisations aimed at directing community life along moral lines to the exclusion of the liturgical place of the church (pietistic movement).

Here, apart from the intimations of the above negative expressions, it is important for us to take notice of the somewhat isolated perhaps, yet solid indications of a spiritual renewal which is contributing to the territory of Orthodox theology. One primary, basic indication is to be found with the turn of the recent theological powers of the country towards the creative study of and worthy attention towards patristic tradition,⁴ centring upon the work of Gregory Palamas. In fact, it is possible to observe over the past years a general conscious attempt to combine harmoniously theological opinions with the roots of patristic tradition and patristic interrogation; an attempt which is taking shape in some meaningful works of new theologians as well as in collective productions. In relation to the latter, it is important to underline here the role of the «Patriarchal Institute of Patristic Studies» in Thessaloniki which, in co-operation with the Faculty of Theology there and with the publication of the scholarly periodical *Kleronomia* is cultivating the study of patristic subjects at a perceptibly progressed level (see pp. 147-168).

The presentation which advanced an aim had to refer, only by indication to the book's subject matter of dissensions wherein the interest exceeds to a considerable extent the meaning for the specialist reader. Certainly however, the necessarily confined limits for the technicality of the writing as submitted leaves the reader somehow with the opinion that there is a deficiency. This deficiency becomes even more perceptible when we accredit the existence of possibilities for more definite conclusions. In other words: the seriousness for modern Greek arbitrary problems which are touched upon by Dr. Yannaras and even the multiple presuppositions which he brings together for their confrontation, make it evident that in the future we must hope for a broader discussion of the subject. In particular, the second essay of the present volume can provide the draft for a decisive synthesis, which, with the help of historical perspective and systematic exploitation of the rich sources, will critically guide the course of modern Greek Orthodoxy and will ultimately define a mature and conscious appraisal against this limiting factor in Greek theology.

JOHN A. PAPINGIS

Milan Djurcinov, *La Poésie Macédonienne. Anthologie des Origines à nos Jours*, French translation by J. Gaucheron, Guillevic et L. Albertoni in cooperation with Kl. Grupčeva and Vl. Urošević, Prologue by J. Rousselot, Paris, Les éditeurs français réunis, 1972, pp. 238.

This anthology is edited with a prologue by Jean Rousselot, the introduction, selection and notes are by Milan Djurcinov while the translation into French is due to Jacques Gaucheron, Guillevic and Lucie Albertoni in co-operation with Klementina Grupceva and Vlada Urošević. Which is to say that the work of seven people has gone into its production, and one might therefore expect the pieces it contains to be the most representative of Macedonian poetry, consonant with the usual purpose and scope of anthologies. In spite of the collaboration of so many people, however, the present edition fails to correspond to its somewhat ambitious aims. All too obvious is the attempt to bridge the gaps with texts that belong to the literature of other nations or to fill out the anthology with prose instead of poetry, for the sole purpose of bestowing a life-span of centuries on the literature of a language that was imposed after the Second World War.

Although the title of the book refers to poetry, the anthology opens with a prose item, an extract from the panegyric sermon of Clement in honour of Cyril and Methodius. As is well known, however, this sermon belongs properly to the Old Slavonic branch of Letters. Next follows demotic (folk) poetry, of which thirteen examples are given, three of them in prose. Then the poets begin to appear, starting with Gr. Parličev in the second half of the nineteenth century. One can only wonder what justification there is for such a leap over ten centuries with only demotic poetry in the interval. Evidently, for a thousand years Macedonian literature can have produced nothing worthy of inclusion in the anthology.

Included among the works of Gr. Parličev is an extract from his poem "Le Serdar". But this poem was composed in Greek and received an award at a poetry competition held in Athens; it belongs, therefore, to Greek literature, and is quite out of place in this anthology. Perhaps the editors were misled by the fact that Parličev was born in Achrida, a small town in what is today Yugoslavian Macedonia — hardly a sound justification when it is considered that as well as Parličev, two other writers included in the anthology, Rajko Zinzifov and Konstantin Miladinov, also regarded themselves as Bulgarians, wrote in the Bulgarian language — except when they wrote in Greek — and devoted their lives to the revival of the Bulgarian nation. They have absolutely no place in present collection.

The remaining and greater part of the anthology (pp. 87-232) contains works by contemporary poets. From the introductory notes we learn some useful and enlightening facts about the Macedonian language and its literature. The first book in the Macedonian language was printed in Yugoslavia in 1938 (p. 89). One of the creators of the Macedonian literary language is Bl. Koneski, born in 1929, who published his first book in 1945 (p. 99). The first Macedonian novel was published in 1953 (p. 111). The earliest evidence of the musical and poetical vigour of the fledgling Macedonian literary language is a collection printed at the end of the Second World War. (p. 119). I should also like to observe that R. Pavlovski, the most significant poet included in the anthology if the criterion of quantity is taken as indicative, was born only in 1937 (pp. 173-191).

With the omission of a considerable number of pages, the book might have been published as an anthology of contemporary poets of Yugoslavian Macedonia. As such it would rate as a most welcome contribution to letters, free of today's artificiality.

University of Thessaloniki

CHARALAMBOS K. PAPASTATHIS

Jerome M. Gillison, *British and Soviet Politics. A Study of Legitimacy and Convergence*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972.

I

It is risky but potentially fruitful to ask a historian to review a book by a political scientist, particularly when the theme is the comparative approach. Historians are likely to broaden the frame of reference and to alter the rules of the game, which is always a dirty trick. But who knows what the rules of comparative studies are? Let the occasion be used then not only for a scrutiny of Professor Gillison's book on British and Soviet politics, but also for venturing some basic reflections on the nature of comparison between different political «systems» (as a historian I prefer the more inclusive term «policy») in the present state of world affairs.

It may be best if I put my cards on the table at the outset in order to establish the framework within which to judge Professor Gillison's book and others like it. All observers will agree, I trust, that comparison — and invidious comparison prompted by a pervasive craving