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

DAVID HOLTON


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
for Soviet domination, and has set out to "offer some fresh analytical perspectives on a number of contemporary, theoretical and practical relationships between Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union." He focuses his attention on five basic topics: the international socialist "system," its East European core, communism as an international doctrine, the role of East European international organizations, and Moscow's "new type" international relations.

Writing in mid-1967, Jamgotch finds that the international system of socialist states—with smaller and more homogeneous subsystems in Europe and Asia—is "surely less cohesive than an alliance or a bloc, but for this very reason it possesses more internal resilience, and its individual units in turn gain the ability to resist unwanted pressures and blandishments." Reviewing the system's history since the upheavals of 1956, he concludes that it has for the most part been characterized by "continuous pragmatic adjustments on the part of the Soviet Union to marked national independence and diversity among the East European states, followed by ideological heterogeneity clearly alien to the precepts of Marxism-Leninism."

In reviewing the security considerations which compelled the Soviet Union to obtain control of East Europe, Jamgotch argues convincingly that more than the defense of that country is now at issue. Thus, "Once a power has committed itself to the worldwide application of its political doctrines, the preservation of its regime essence, as distinct from its territory, becomes a continuing responsibility and major concern. It is in this essence that the maintenance of Marxist-Leninist political systems of Eastern Europe has assumed added significance for the Soviet Union." He points out that Soviet theoreticians refuse to consider the possible incompatibility between the logical extension of proletarian internationalism and the demands of particularistic national interests. Nevertheless, they recognize that the nation-state, however transitional, remains a stubborn feature of the present international system. Accordingly, special interim arrangements are needed to bring together for the common good independent states pursuing socialist-communist aims.

The author concludes that the fourteen socialist states do in fact represent a "viable international system which has long dispensed with stringent Soviet tutelage and the Stalinist fetish for monolithism and homogeneity." At the same time he finds that relations between Communist Parties have tended to deteriorate steadily as functional and
governmental relations improved. This trend appears to be leading to a "regional integration based on a community of East European national interests rather than on dogmatic rectitude." And, lastly, "If Soviet leaders must advocate worldwide communism and dream about its mythological comforts, the most they may realistically expect is that carefully cultivated relationships with their East European neighbors might brighten the prospects for Communism on a genuinely international, if disappointingly local, scale."

Jamgotch has carefully defined his subject-matter so as to leave his generalizations largely undisturbed by the Sino-Soviet "dialogue" of recent years. He has offered some very pointed ideas on the workings of Soviet relations with the communist regimes of East Europe, ideas that fully deserve the attention of Western observers. Whether the Soviet-Czechoslovak "dialogue" of 1968 and the Brezhnev "Doctrine" which accompanied it have refuted his findings remains to be seen.

Southern Connecticut State College
JOHN O. IATRIDES

Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies
Oxford 5-10 September 1966, edited by J.M. Hussey, D. Obo-
lensky, and S. Runciman. London, Oxford University Press,

Since this volume does not contain all of the papers presented at the 1966 Byzantine Congress in Oxford, it does not offer a full perspective on the current state and preoccupations of the field, insofar as the Congress offered one. Nevertheless, this is still an impressive collection of papers, demonstrating the flourishing health and the striking characteristics of diversity which are both features of Byzantine studies today.

Diversity is certainly apparent in the variety of approaches and disciplines brought together. Indeed, the one approach conspicuous by its relative absence is the once-conventional one of political history, barely one or two of the papers published here might liberally be classified under that heading. But there is almost everything else: church, cultural, art, social, and administrative history; musicology; ethnography; archaeology; numismatics; hagiography; and historical geography.