

repeats his thesis of the nature of the tradition: that it is not a question of different "versions," each transmitted by several manuscripts, but rather of various groups of more or less closely related manuscripts "version-groups." On the question of the Armenian version (p. 11), it should be noted that its translator, although drawing on material from what we now call the *b* tradition, basically employed a manuscript of the *a* tradition.

The 16th century woodcuts are a welcome addition, since they are otherwise only to be found in rather inaccessible early printed books. However, it is not made sufficiently clear that except for the frontispiece (Alexander riding Bukephalos) they are not proper to the Alexander romance itself, but to the Iliad: the picture of "King Nectanebo" (p. 27) in fact depicts Zeus sitting on Mount Ida outside Troy, that of "the duel of Alexander and Poros" was originally executed to illustrate the confrontation of Achilles and Agamemnon, and so on. Regretably the medieval tradition of illustrations of the Alexander romance did not continue into the era of printing. (On the commissioning of these woodcuts for the edition of Lukanis' Iliad see the illuminating article of Professore Follieri, "Su Alcuni libri greci stampati a Venezia nella prima metà del cinquecento" in *Contributi alla storia del libro italiano, Miscellanea in onore di Lamberto Donati*, ed. Leo S. Olschki, Florence 1969, pp. 119-164).

Four basic divisions of the material are made: A. The Alexander chapbooks; B. The Alexander tradition in erudite literature; C. The oral tradition; and D. The universality of the Alexander myth. In its attractive new format the work is a valuable compendium of scholarly information about the Modern Greek Alexander tradition in all its ramifications, yet at the same time highly readable and absorbing for the non-specialist.

Hertford College, Oxford

DAVID HOLTON

Foreign Relations of the United States. 1946. Vol. III. Paris Peace Conference: Proceedings. Vol. IV. Paris Peace Conference: Documents. Edited in the Historical Office, Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State. Department of State Publications 8491, 8492. Washington, D.C.: U.S.G.P.O., 1970. Pp. 882 and 956.

In 1947 the Department of State published an offset volume, *Paris*

Peace Conference: Selected Documents. At the same time, the French Government published its *Collection of Documents of the Paris Conference* (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1947), which remains a standard four-volume compilation of Conference papers. The Department of State has now come forth with these two convenient and comprehensive volumes, which cover the period of the Paris Peace Conference (July 29-October 15, 1946), and include the proceedings of the Council of Foreign Ministers and their Deputies, as well as those of the Peace Conference itself. The compilation presents documentation on the Conference of twenty-one nations which were represented at Paris. The proceedings and the documentation deal with the drafting of the peace treaties with Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Finland, and the volumes should be studied, among other materials, along with Volumes VI and VII (1946) of the *Foreign Relations* series, which contain related materials bearing on Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union and the Near East and Africa.

Insofar as students of the Balkan region, the Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East are concerned, attention will center on the problems of Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Greece and Libya. The beginnings of the Greek problem in the United Nations, as reflected in incidents along the northern Greek frontiers, may be traced in these well-documented papers. The Greek claims to Northern Epirus, and the reflections thereon in conversation and conference, are considered (III, 101-102, 256-257, 263, 270, 321, 615-616; IV, 854). So also are the Greek and Bulgarian claims and counter-claims as to possible frontier changes (III, 300-302, 341-342, 380-381, 408-409, 442-443, 449-451, 463-464, 611-612; IV, 481-482, 855-856.) Study of these problems, together with that of the sad economic plight of Greece during this period, should be filled out by reference to the American documents on that country in Vol. VII (pp. 88-288). One will also find an interesting observation on the problem of the Turkish Straits in these pages, which deserves recalling, from the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr. Molotov, who remarked on October 10 (pp. 761-762): "At Potsdam President Truman and Mr. Byrnes had widened the scale of the discussion by taking up the question of the regime for the Danube, the Rhine and the Black Sea Straits at one time. The previous Danube regime established in 1856 was the expression of imperialism and while Mr. Bevin had said that Great Britain had abandoned the imperialism of the 19th century a regime similar to the previous imperialistic regime was now put forward. It was not pos-

sible for the Soviet Union to accept this project. Why was there such concentration on nondiscrimination for the Danube when there were other important waterways, specifically, the Suez Canal and the Panama Canal?"

There are many gems in these two volumes which now await convenient mining for those who will now be able to study them carefully. They are commended to all research students.

The American University
Washington, D.C.

HARRY N. HOWARD

Stephen Fischer-Galati, *The New Rumania: From People's Democracy to Socialist Republic*. Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Studies in International Communism, 10. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, The M.I.T. Press, 1967. Pp. 126.

Professor Fischer-Galati has written a clear and convincing historical analysis of the "desatellization" of Rumania. Since the work is a companion volume to John Michael Montias's *The Economic Development of Rumania* in M.I.T.'s series: Studies in International Communism, Fischer-Galati concentrates on the political aspects of Bucharest's deviation from Moscow.

The author demonstrates that Rumania's posture of independence was not a sudden reversal of a policy of subservience to the Kremlin; but that the public revelations of disagreement between Bucharest and Moscow in 1963 and particularly in April, 1964, showed a split which had resulted from the pragmatic actions taken by Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej throughout his career. If before 1963 there was less noticeable ferment in Rumania than in Hungary or Poland, this apparent compliance resulted from Gheorghiu-Dej's skillful ability to keep Rumanian politics quiet and in hand.

Gheorghiu-Dej, in fact, emerges as the central figure in guiding Rumania's independent path. The author traces his role to the days of liberation (August, 1944) when, as a "native" centrist between the "Moscovites" (e.g. Ana Pauker and Vasile Luca) and the free communists led by Lucretiu Patrascanu, he was able to emerge as a national leader.

While Gheorghiu-Dej was still imprisoned in the spring of 1944, the Kremlin was attempting to obtain Marshal Antonescu's surrender,