

one expects the book to be politically value-free. However, in discussing the Greek practice of the dissolution of parliaments, Markesinis tends to treat British practice as a norm from which Greek practice deviated, instead of trying simply to explain why the two practices differed. Of course, this would have meant examining the topic in terms of politics, political science, and political culture, especially since the dissolution of a parliament is a political act par excellence within rather vague constitutional parameters. Such further inquiry would have suggested, first, that the two-party system in England by contrast to the multiparty system in Greece was one of the main reasons why the two practices differed; and, second, that kings of Greece, despite their Danish origin, were likely to behave differently in Greece from the way they would have behaved in Denmark or England, simply because they found themselves in a Greek, not a Danish or English, political setting. Greek political parties were not durable or cohesive. They were personality-based and extremely fragile. Their leaders and would-be leaders were likely to behave in political ways that would be unthinkable to any of their colleagues in the British Conservative, Liberal, or Labour parties in response to the king's political maneuvers, which were often engaged in with the advice of Greek politicians themselves or other advisers.

Besides containing certain minor errors in Greek names (such as Constantine instead of Panayotis Pipinelis, p. 251), Markesinis's account of what transpired when King Paul I commissioned Constantine Karamanlis to form a government after the death of Premier Alexander Papagos on October 6, 1955 (pp. 209–10) omits the fact that Karamanlis refused to accept the leadership of Papagos's Greek Rally Party until and unless Parliament gave him a vote of confidence. Meanwhile a five-member committee of that party, consisting of Karamanlis, E. J. Tsouderos, P. Kanellopoulos, S. Stefanopoulos, and C. Rodopoulos, assumed the leadership. This suggests that both the beneficiary of the king's commission and the other Greek Rally Party leaders were agreed that if the monarch had intended to appoint Karamanlis as head of the party as well, he was acting improperly. The unimplemented constitutions of 1968 and 1973, incidentally, were to make it clear that the head of state would be acting also unlawfully if he ever tried again to act in the same way.

STEPHEN G. XYDIS
Hunter College, CUNY

PROBLEMY SLAVIANSKOGO FOL'KLORA. By *N. I. Kravtsov*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1972. 360 pp. 1.63 rubles.

This volume is a collection of the author's articles, published separately over the years. Kravtsov is one of the very few folklorists able to survey the whole range of Slavic folklores and make a comparative study of them, and the present volume is therefore a valuable one. The articles include: "A Work of Folklore as an Artistic Whole," "The Art of Psychological Portrayal in Russian Folklore," "The System of Genres of Russian Folklore," "Text and Melody in Folk Songs," "Folklore and Mythology," "The Serb Epos and History," "The Slavic Folk Ballad," "Bulgarian Folk Proverbs," "Harvest Songs in Bulgarian Nineteenth-Century Folklore," "Romanticism in the Slavic Literatures and Folklore," and "The Study of Slavic Folklore." The articles are uneven, but the best of them, such as the first one (actually a detailed analysis of the Russian ballad "Muzh-soldat v gost'iakh u

zheny"), along with the articles on "The Serb Epos and History" and "The Slavic Folk Ballad," are distinguished by a common-sense approach all too rare in Slavic folklore study. Thus Kravtsov easily demonstrates the falsity of the too-often-repeated definition of the ballad as a "lyrico-epic" genre. The terms "lyric" and "epic," he properly insists, refer to types of subject development and not to emotional atmosphere. Viewed in this light, the ballad is purely epic. (In English we would probably say "narrative.") He also rejects as uneconomical any view of epos as derived from older traditions or legends (not to mention textual sources): there is no reason to suppose that epic songs, in an epic age, could not have arisen directly from the events they describe. But the fact that the epos is basically "historical" should not lead us to insist that it should be "history." It is not history, but song—in other words, art.

A few of the essays are spoiled by triviality or excessive devotion to Marxist shibboleths. The second essay, which has a promising beginning, breaks down because of the lack of a suitable theory of characterization. But on the whole the collection can be recommended.

WILLIAM E. HARKINS
Columbia University

LANGUAGE AND PROSODY OF THE RUSSIAN FOLK EPIC. By Roy G. Jones. Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 275. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1972. 105 pp. 32 Dglds.

The problem of Russian folk versification has been under study since Vostokov's pioneering work in 1817. In the United States, significant contributions have been made by Roman Jakobson, Kiril Taranovsky, William Harkins, and James Bailey. Roy G. Jones's book is an ambitious attempt to give an in-depth analysis of the major problems of prosody and language in the Russian epic. The study is based on the *byliny* of Trofim Riabinin (one of the finest Russian singers) as recorded by Gilferding in 1871. Instead of the fourth edition of this collection (1949–51) which has been used, the first edition would have been more suitable, since (as Bailey has shown) the texts in it are more accurate in syllabification and stressing.

Jones discusses meter and rhythm, rhythmic units, repetition of prepositions, morphological variants within the line, epic formulas, and the development of the epic line in Russian. He defines the meter in terms of the obligatory stresses and demonstrates that the thirteen and eleven-syllable lines dominate. The repetition of prepositions is shown to have acquired metrical function; likewise, the choice between the long and short endings of adjectives is demonstrated to be determined by the meter. The author proposes that the development of the verse line in Russian evolved from the Proto-Slavic type reconstructed by Jakobson, and that the establishment of the dactylic ending of the line caused a rhythmic conflict in the originally trochaic line, which led to the elimination of the break and expansion of line length.

The line length as applied by Jones is not the actual length. He has added two unstressed syllables to those as counted from the first obligatory stress, whether or not there were any unstressed syllables in the anacrusis. This makes it hard to compare his findings with those in other works giving the actual number of syllables or feet.

FELIX J. OINAS
Indiana University