

the diplomatic intricacies, he had reserved some space for an introduction to the history, geography, and society of Cyprus, and for a conclusion which would have put the negotiations into a larger perspective.

The need for interpretation is only partially filled by the section of the book which will be of interest to a second group of readers—scholars of diplomacy in general, for whom the Cyprus negotiations can serve as a case study. The sixty-page introductory essay, "On State-Building in General and the Cyprus Case in Particular," is divided into two sections: "On the Proliferation of States" and "Micro-politics in the Case of Cyprus State-Building." In the first section Xydis compares the factors leading to the establishment of a Cypriote state to other similar situations in recent world history (for example, establishment of Jordan, Manchukuo, and the states of central Europe after World War I). In the second section, he gives some specific background to the Cyprus negotiations, but he is mainly concerned to demonstrate how this case illustrates a particular aspect of international relations theory, such as "the resort to unacknowledged use of force in international politics which has been an important feature of the post-World War II era," or the role of non-state actors in international relations.

These are valuable contributions, ably done. But, given Professor Xydis's obvious analytical abilities and his great knowledge of the material, it is all the more disappointing to have to predict that few readers will go beyond the first sixty pages. The great bulk of this volume is likely to result in little more than footnotes for the future work of others who try to examine the entire Cyprus situation and its role in the postwar world and in the politics of the eastern Mediterranean.

WALTER F. WEIKER
Rutgers University, Newark

EARLY RUSSIAN LITERATURE. By *John Fennell* and *Antony Stokes*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974. 295 pp. \$18.50.

While all textbook surveys are necessarily selective, the authors of the present work have been more selective than most. Therefore, they do not claim that their book is "a comprehensive history of early Russian literature"; rather, "it is a collection of studies on those topics, genres, authors and individual literary monuments . . . of particular importance for anyone studying the history of Russian culture. . . ." The precise implications of this formulation may not be readily obvious, but the first four chapters, treating Russian literature up through the sixteenth century (authored by John Fennell), in fact treat no more than fourteen or fifteen works in any detail; chapter 5, on the seventeenth century (by Antony Stokes), is somewhat more inclusive and closer to a conventional textbook presentation. The aim is apparently to be representative rather than inclusive, and even an admitted masterpiece such as Epifanii Premudryi's *Life of Stefan of Perm'* is mentioned only in passing, presumably because fuller treatment has been given to the anonymous *Life of Dmītrii Donskoi*. It may have been an error to choose the lesser and later work in place of the earlier and greater, but cultural and historical considerations, as well as purely literary ones, may have influenced Fennell's decision.

No translated works are treated, a methodological departure perhaps without precedent for the historiography of Old Russian literature. This may shock some

readers, but how many histories of other literatures do treat translations, and is this not the proper procedure?

The selective approach permits the authors, especially Fennell, to concentrate on a few works. This results in some cases in short monographic studies, certain of which (such as the sections on Boris and Gleb, and Alexander Nevsky) make original contributions to scholarship. Also, we have here a textbook that is not "cribbed" from other textbooks, but based on the authors' own direct knowledge of the texts and the more detailed secondary sources. A limitation of the approach is that it produces few general observations about Old Russian literature as a whole, or even about its specific periods.

Style is a favorite topic and invariably treated. Although this does give the reader a sense of contact with the text itself, at times one is tempted to ask whether, in certain cases, a synopsis would not have served almost as well and more economically. The preference for stylistic analysis is surprising in view of the emphasis at the outset on the "history of Russian culture." Curiously, though Fennell is himself a historian, as well as a philologist, and has published the texts themselves, his analysis of the Kurbsky-Grozny correspondence is largely stylistic with almost nothing about the politics or the world view of either correspondent.

Chapter 4, on *The Tale of Igor's Campaign*, falls "between" the chapters on the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and poses more questions than it answers. Clearly Fennell does not believe the *Tale* to be a forgery of the eighteenth century, nor can he accept it as a work of the twelfth. It seems that he would be best pleased were it to fall chronologically sometime *after* the *Zadonshchina* and to derive from that work.

WILLIAM E. HARKINS
Columbia University

BYLINA AND FAIRY TALE: THE ORIGINS OF RUSSIAN HEROIC POETRY. By *Alex E. Alexander*. Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 281. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1973. 162 pp. 38 Dglds.

Mr. Alexander's thesis is that the Russian *bylina* evolved from the fairy tale because "the aesthetic relationship between the fairy tale and the *bylina* is that of fiction versus artistic truth, or discredited versus credited myth" (p. 121). He rejects as unlikely the notion that the *bylina* and the fairy tale developed independently from pagan mythology and offers instead an explanation of the *bylina* as a "fairy tale history of Kievan Rus'." Alexander reproduces many of the arguments for the historicity of the *bylina* with which scholars have been familiar for some time. He admits, however, that "many names of people and places are historically verifiable, which allows for the coexistence of purely fictional names with factual ones. For example, Il'ja may be purely fictional, but Murom is not: his historically verifiable origins make the hero a historical figure, a Kievan warrior in whose past existence one can believe" (p. 88). That is not a very plausible argument, in the opinion of this reviewer, and it is a pity Mr. Alexander was unaware of recent research touching, in part, on this very matter.

Indeed, the main problem with Mr. Alexander's book, aside from its lack of proper editing, is that it is simply out of date. He could not have known, for instance, of the fundamental work by V. V. Ivanov and V. N. Toporov, *Issledo-*