

lowers; Ristić has unfortunately not followed this example. While Paul regarded as distinctly possible either a German victory or a negotiated peace that would place Eastern Europe under German domination (witness the Western policy at Munich), the conspirators calculated on Britain being joined by the Soviet Union and the United States (Roosevelt's electoral victory, plus passage of the Lend-Lease Bill on 9 March 1941, were rightly regarded as virtually a declaration of war on Germany) in a long but triumphant war. And, the conspirators argued, Yugoslavia's very existence required it to back the British and Americans from the outset; if not, they might well decide at the peace conference to settle the Croat-Serb rivalry, with the international tensions it had engendered, by simply dissolving the Yugoslav state. Moreover, the military picture was by no means entirely black: German airpower had been repulsed over Britain, while Italy had already suffered major defeats in Albania since mid-November, in Libya since December, and at sea in the British air attack on Taranto in November. A Yugoslav blow in Albania that might help knock Italy out of the war would insure Yugoslavia's standing in Western eyes for decades; was the gain not worth the risk? And, if worst came to worst, a retreat to Thessaloniki or even overseas was always possible. Honor would thus be saved and the Yugoslav state with it. As to those suffering in Axis-occupied Yugoslavia, four centuries of Ottoman rule had taught the ordinary citizen how to survive. So reasoned Simović and his associates.

To the pessimistic pragmatism of Prince Paul, a cultivated and worldly man whose memories were more of British art galleries and country houses than of the devastating wars from which Yugoslavia had emerged, they opposed a ruthless yet romantic nationalism which demanded of each Serb that he let no opportunity pass to die for the Yugoslav state which his elders had helped create and whose domination he enjoyed. The *coup* thus represented a basic clash between opposing political concepts; any account which overlooks this factor can only convey an incomplete, an inadequate, a lopsided picture of historical reality.

Oakland University

LEONARD BUSHKOFF

Robert Flacelière, *A Literary History of Greece*, trans. Douglas Garman. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1964. Pp. 395.

This translation is a welcome addition to the bibliography on the

subject in English. It is intended for the general reader, and was conceived, as the author himself tells us, as a counterpart to his book on the private life of the ancient Greeks. It aspires to give a picture in 380 pp. of Greek culture through the writings of the great classical authors from Homer to Plotinus—a tall order indeed, in view of the quantity of talent and genius which filled the “classical” centuries. On the whole, however, the book achieves its purpose, and not only the general reader, but also the specialist will find it useful and stimulating at many points.

As might be expected, all the branches of the literary endeavour of the Greeks are examined: the epic, lyric poetry, tragedy, comedy, historiography, oratory and philosophy, to say nothing of lesser achievements like the novel. The book is divided into seven sections, each being preceded by a short chapter on the historical background of the relevant period, for the author “follows the successive generations step by step.” However, this close adherence to a time period often confuses the picture of the development of certain literary *genres*. In tragedy, for example, the Birth of Tragedy is treated on pp. 109-11, Aeschylus on pp. 138-56, Sophocles on pp. 183-93, and Euripides 13 pages further on, separated from Sophocles by three whole chapters on philosophy. A more concentrated treatment of tragedy, as indeed of historiography (to say nothing of philosophy), would make clearer both the achievement of the Greeks in those fields, and the debt of the modern world to them.

In its general approach and its evaluation of the classical authors, this is a very conservative book, and on the whole even a rather conventional one. There are no new, bold reappraisals or unexpected criticism of the great figures of the past. It could even be called old-fashioned, if not outdated, in certain important topics. In the long chapter on Homer, for example, conventional views are on the whole repeated, and not a word is said about the fundamental work done in recent years on the Homeric epics by Milman Parry and his followers. Nor is any true understanding shown of the nature of orally transmitted poetry.

Flacelière clearly responds to the classical era more readily than to the Hellenistic age, and few will blame him for that. However, this results in certain omissions, with the author taking certain traditional interpretations for granted, interpretations which recent research have shown to be unacceptable. It is indeed surprising that nothing is said about the Alexandrian Epigram and what it has offered to subsequent literature; men like Asclepiades, Poseidippus or Leonidas of Tarentum

are not even mentioned. And it is equally strange that the Second Sophistic and "Atticism"—the central literary dispute in the Greco-Roman world—are not referred to, not even when the works of men like Dio Chrysostomus or Lucian are examined. These authors cannot be properly understood without referring to the broader literary framework within which they wrote.

Nor (to mention only a few traditional but no longer tenable views) can Theocritus be any longer considered younger than Callimachus (see R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, Introduction to vol. II), or the Alexandra (not Alexandria as it is spelt four times on p. 345) be unhesitatingly attributed to Lycophron. Nor can it be stated that the mimes of Herodas (not Herondas) were probably performed.

But these and other objections, while perhaps inevitable in a book of this size on so vast a subject, are soon swept aside by our response to the enthusiasm of the author and his devotion to classical culture. I would subscribe to all he tells us in his general conclusions in the last chapter. These are best summarized in his own words: "It is perhaps precisely today, when man finds himself more than at any time in the past threatened with 'dehumanization' by the machine and the marvelous and terrible developments of technique, that he needs to seek reassurance in the deepest roots of his being by reference to his own origins. And it was in Greece that our contemporary civilization was born" (p. 378). I have no doubt that Flacelière's book, elegantly translated by Mr. Garman, will stimulate much interest in classical Greek studies and will help many to turn "to the deepest roots of their being."

Exeter College, Oxford

C. A. TRYPANIS

*Looking at Greece* by Francis Noel-Baker. Adam and Charles Black, London. J. B. Lippincott Co. Philadelphia and New York. 1967. Pp. 66+2 Maps.

Great Britain cannot boast a better Philhellene at the present time than the author of this excellent pictorial guide to Greece. Francis Noel-Baker has deep roots in the second largest of the Greek islands. He is one of Greece's important landowners, speaks Greek with faultless ease, is chairman of an invaluable Anglo-Greek organisation for philanthropic enterprises in Euboeia, and with his experience of the British way