Also included is an account of a trip to the Coast, en route to which we are introduced to a somewhat bohemian although ideologically committed painter in the provincial society of Mostar, a description all the more interesting since most Yugoslav intellectuals and artists tend to seek their careers in the major cities, shunning the idea of life in a small town.

These three books, despite certain individual shortcomings, are important additions to our knowledge of the changes occurring in Yugoslav life and enable us to make significant comparisons between political innovation and fundamental alterations in social patterns.

University of Massachusetts, Amherst
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It is remarkable that the subject of the Alexander tradition in modern Greek literature and culture in general has for so long lacked the sort of detailed, comprehensive research which Dr. Veloudis has now applied to it. So the recent development of the Alexander legend, stemming as it does in a direct and unbroken line from the pseudo-Cal- listhenic versions, has at last been accorded the scholarly study which it deserves.

By way of introduction (pp. 1-10) the author conducts us on a 2000 year tour on manifestations of the Alexander legend, from the Hollywood film of 1955 back to its Hellenistic origins. He emphasises the almost universal dissemination of the theme — there are versions in nearly all languages which possess a literature worthy of the name — and its enormous popularity. The most important part of his work is his investigation of the modern Greek chapbooks of Alexander, the one in prose, familiarly known as the Φυλλάδα του Μεγάλεξαντρου, and the other in rhyming verse called for the sake of convenience the Rīmada.

In chapter I (pp. 11-47) Dr. Veloudis considers the Phyllada, its manuscripts and numerous printed editions, its sources and its date.
The Phyllada is descended from the Byzantine romance of Alexander in prose: just when the ms tradition of the latter dries up, the former appears for the first time in the printing presses of Venice. Unfortunately, however, none of the many mss of the Byzantine prose romance which we possess offers a text close to that of the Phyllada, or one which may have served as a direct model for it. The most closely related ms seems to be that of Meteora (Monastery of the Transfiguration) Codex No. 400 which is datel 1640. The late Byzantine prose version which this ms contains can be treated as the model of the modern Greek prose version which begins its printed history in Venice at about 1680 (the precise date of the first edition cannot be ascertained). Dr. Veloudis lists 43 printed editions of the Phyllada, thus adding many hitherto unknown editions to previous bibliographical researches. As in the case of the pseudo-Callisthenes tradition, it is impossible and pointless to reconstruct an original "version" of the Phyllada. Each and every ms, both of the Hellenistic and the Byzantine romance, is in itself a "version"—a reworking of an earlier text—and must be treated as such. Thus, Dr. Veloudis wisely remarks, we ought no longer to speak of versions \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \varepsilon, \) and \( \lambda \) of pseudo-Callisthenes, but rather of text-groups \( \alpha, \beta \) etc. Each text-group will include many "versions," each of which must be published separately. Comparative editions, in which the apparatus criticus occupies as much space on the printed page as the text "edited," are nothing less than falsification.

In examining the sources of the Phyllada we cannot exclude the possibility that its author had at his disposal more than one text of the late Byzantine tradition, and in addition had recourse to his own imagination and the oral tradition. A detailed comparison of the Phyllada with the extant texts of the Byzantine and pseudo-Callisthenic traditions leads Dr. Veloudis to the conclusion already reached by Merkelbach (though with some slight modifications), viz. that the primary source of the Phyllada was a version of group \( \gamma \) enriched with episodes from a ms of group \( \alpha \) and, at one point only, from a ms of group \( \lambda \). This "contaminated" version had at some date after 1430 reached a form close to the text offered by Codex Vindob. Theol. Gr. 244, and, after further reworkings and the addition of elements from the oral tradition, arrived in 1640, or very shortly before, at the form of Codex Met. 400, which can be considered as the model of the Phyllada.

In chapter II (pp. 48-81) Dr. Veloudis treats the less well-known modern Greek Alexander poem. Unlike the case of the Phyllada there
is no recent edition of the Rimada, though this omission will shortly be rectified. The author informs us that he is engaged on a critical edition of the poem, and I have also been working independently on an edition which is now in a form ready for publication. To judge from our different conclusions as to the significance of the ms, Dr. Veloudis's edition will be founded on rather different principles from my own. The ms to which I allude—the only extant one of the Rimada—is contained in Meteora Codex 445 (Monastery of the Transfiguration). It offers a text by and large identical with that of the first printed edition of 1529, and there are gaps in the ms which correspond almost exactly to the illustrations of the printed edition. Clearly these blank spaces (like those in Codex Laurentianus Ashburnensis 1444) were left for suitable illustrations to be executed at a later date, an intention which was never realised. The obvious conclusion that the ms was copied from the printed edition is, says the author, mistaken because: a) the ms, if a copy, would have to be completely dependent on the printed edition, which is not the case; b) the printed edition offers a slightly better text, which would be unthinkable if the ms were a copy of the printed edition; and c) the coincidence of the gaps with the illustrations of the edition can be explained by the use of a common illustrated model by both the copyist and the publisher. Only the last of these reasons is valid: the ms and the edition could both be descended from an earlier ms. In this way the occasional omissions of lines in the ms could also be satisfactorily explained. There are, however, two pieces of typographical evidence which I would like to produce here, which prove conclusively that the Meteora ms was copied from a printed edition, either the editio princeps of 1529 or the second edition of 1553: (1) the ms reading "μηνοκαρτερής" (f. 2v. 3 = v. 22 according to my numbering) is due to the fact that a broken α used in the type-setting bears a superficial resemblance to an o and was misread as such by the copyist; (2) at v. 775 (= f. 23v. 3) the a of "δλόγυρα" is printed back to front; the confused scribe, ignorant of the mechanics of printing, interpreted the letter as o and wrote "δλόγυρο".

The authorship of the Rimada is a vexed question. The epilogue, appended to the editions of 1520, 1553, 1600, 1603 and 1620 but properly belonging only to the editio princeps, states that the printer had long desired to find a correct ms of the story of Alexander; he came across one but it turned out to be old, damaged and full of mistakes; he who put it into verse and rhyme is in Zakynthos, but he failed to
send something or other to Venice despite the writer's entreaties to him to do so; so the writer himself was compelled to do the best he could and therefore begs forgiveness for any errors. Finally the epilogue gives the date of publication of the work and attributes it to the "labours and dexterity" of Dimitrios Zinos.

Dr. Veloudis, rightly, I believe, returns to the opinion of Legrand that Zinos was not the author of the poem but merely its first publisher. He thinks that the poem was written some years before the date of publication, perhaps about 1600, by Markos Depharanas or someone similar. Having circulated in ms form for perhaps 30 years and attained a good deal of popularity, the poem eventually reached the printing press in 1529, after Zinos had corrected a rather dilapidated ms of it. Much of the language of the epilogue is so ambiguous that other interpretations would not be impossible. It is feasible that the dilapidated ms to which it refers was of a late-Byzantine prose version of the romance. At the publisher's request an unknown poet from Zakynthos put this text into verse. For some reason this version was unprintable as it stood—perhaps its dialectical peculiarities were too marked for the cosmopolitan Greek community of Venice—so Dimitrios Zinos, a well-known corrector of mss, undertook the task of normalising the language as far as was possible without ruining the rhyme or metre. This hypothesis, which I tentatively put forward, would account for the sporadic dialexical features which the language of the Rimada seems to exhibit. In order to assess the extent of Zinos's contribution to the published form of the poem it would be necessary to compare it with the modern Greek "Batrachomyomachia" (first published circa 1539) of which he was definitely the translator.

In his third chapter (pp. 82-137) the author considers the modern Greek chapbook in general, the social and economic factors which gave rise to this cultural phenomenon, and the importance of the chapbook as a vehicle for transmitting literary themes across linguistic and national frontiers. With this survey as background he passes on to a closer study of the two Alexander chapbooks in modern Greek, and discusses the printed history of the two books, first in the hands of Italian and later of Greek printers. He explains the disappearance of the Rimada from the presses after 1805 as being due to the difficulty of bringing the language of an idiomatic poetic text up to date and thereby adapting it to the contemporary needs of its reading (and listening) public. The Phyllada, which did not begin its printed history until cir-
ca 1680, continued to undergo successive editions until 1926, when the disastrous outcome of the Turkish wars had rendered obsolete the national aspirations which it represented.

One of the most fascinating features of the 1529 edition of the Rimada is its 14 woodcuts in Venetian Renaissance style. These same illustrations, Dr. Veloudis tells us, are also found in the 1553 edition, with the exception of one depicting Alexander riding Bukephalos which is there replaced by a similar but different woodcut. I have traced 13 of these woodcuts to the first edition of Nikolaos Lukani's translation of the Iliad, (which was published in 1526, not 1529 as the author states on p. 128). Curiously enough the missing picture is again that which in the Alexander romance serves to illustrate Alexander mounted on Bukephalos. One is tempted to suppose that this cannot be coincidental.

In the remainder of this chapter the author analyses in detail the world of the Alexander chapbook, its attitude to nature and the supernatural, the names of the peoples and countries mentioned in it, its characters, their religion and morality, and the social milieu which is depicted in it.

In chapter IV (pp. 138-166) Dr. Veloudis discusses various shorter texts which shed light to a greater or lesser extent on the modern Greek Alexander tradition: 1) the "Letters of various philosophers etc." printed by Aldus Manutius in 1499, and the "Apophthegmata" of Arsenios Apostolis (1519); 2) a Meteora ms (Codex 338 of the Monastery of the Transfiguration) which contains a modern Greek translation of the Oracle-book of pseudo-Methodios; 3) 1 poem on Alexander by Manthos Ioannu, an early 18th century emigré to Venice (to the editions of his works listed by the author may be added one of 1809, an exemplar of which is to be found in the Bodleian Library, Oxford); 4) the "Letter of Alexander to Aristotle" translated from the Italian and published in Venice in 1758; and 5) two histories of Alexander the Great, one by D. Gobdelas, the other by G. Manos, published in the 1820s.

In the remaining chapters Dr. Veloudis examines Alexander in historiography and chronography during the Turkokratia (pp. 167-193), Alexander in other forms of literature during the Turkokratia, (the earlier limit of which he extends to the 13th century for this purpose, (pp. 194-226), Alexander in the oral tradition of folk-songs, fairytales, legends and incantations (pp. 227-252), Alexander in the shadow-theatre (pp. 253-264), Alexander and Digenis, pictorial represen
tations of Alexander and Alexander in modern Greek learned literature (pp. 265-283), and finally the popular conceptions of the "Heldenleven" of Alexander (pp. 284-295).

In his desire to emphasise the continuity and extent of the Alexander tradition in modern Greek life and literature Dr Veloudis amply succeeds. Drawing on evidence which covers a time-span from Niketas Choniates to Nikos Kazantzakis, he builds up a composite and enthralling picture of what Alexander has meant, and perhaps to a lesser extent still means, to the Greek people, as an embodiment of their dreams and aspirations, a model of godly living, against the transitory things of this world, and—it must not be forgotten—a source of entertainment.

Hartford College, Oxford
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In 1964, two Soviet students of international politics, M.E. Airapetian and V.V. Sukhodeve, published a book arguing that relations among socialist states, unlike those among capitalist nations, are based upon a new foundation marked by "brotherly mutual help, comradely cooperation, and firm and solid friendship among peoples who effectively manifest the principle of proletarian internationalism." The authors examined closely the fourteen-member "socialist commonwealth of nations" that represents the "international socialist system" by analyzing six types of interaction: ideological, political, economic, cultural, international-legal, and the system's impact upon international politics generally. They concluded that the "socialist commonwealth" constitutes in fact a "higher order" of inter-state relations, enjoyed only by countries under communist rule. Inspired by proletarian internationalism and motivated by totally compatible ideological, political, social, economic and cultural aims, they have acquired a common identity and are happily engaged in voluntary, fraternal cooperation in the service of socialism-communism at home and abroad.

These interesting claims about a new type of international relations are reviewed in this brief but well-written monograph. The author has wisely resisted the temptation to dismiss this "dialogue" between the Kremlin and the ruling elites of East Europe as a mere euphemism