

concepts of social property raise practical questions with regard to foreign investment in Yugoslav enterprises. Although a new law was passed in 1967 to facilitate foreign investment, Professor Chloros concludes that large scale foreign investment may not be compatible with self-management as it presently exists.

In sum, despite its brevity this is a useful and important book.

University of Massachusetts, Amherst

JOEL M. HALPERN

Istorija na Macedonskiot Narod (=The History of the Macedonian Nation), vol. I, Skopje 1969, pp. 346.

From the Institute of National History in Skopje appeared, in 1969, a publication in three volumes entitled «History of the Macedonian Nation» which, beginning from prehistoric times, recounts historical events in Macedonia until 1945. The first volume is especially concerned with pre-history, ancient and Roman history as well as with events until the 18th century. The second volume is concerned with the period beginning from the start of the 19th century until the end of World War I and the third with the period 1918-1945¹. From the first volume we shall turn our attention to several points in the second chapter which deals with the ancient history of Macedonia, leaving the remaining chapters of this volume to be reviewed by specialists². From the remarks about this chapter the reader will be able to form an appropriate picture of the scholarship, and even more, of the «objectivity» — boasted in the Prologue — with which the whole of the first volume was written!!

The second chapter, which concerns us, was written by Dušica Petruševska. It is entitled «The Formation and Development of the Macedonian Nation» (pp. 33-48 in the History of Skopje) and is divided into seven subchapters which, for each, we have the following observations to make:

a) «The Formation of the Nation. Early History (7th-6th Cent. B. C.)» (pp. 33-34).

1) Although mention is made of the settlement of different races in Macedonia (Thracians, Phrygians, Mygdonians, Bisaltians, Paionians, etc.), the very important Dorian settlement is omitted. This is certainly intentional for otherwise it would be difficult, if not impossible, to dispute their Hellenism.

2) Despite the «investigations» into such questions as the formation of the language and the nationality of the ancient Macedonians, in the end it is not made clear which language was or what was their nationality. This is left to be «derived» by the reader from the sequence of the narration in which, «to exhaustion», distinction is made between the terms «Macedonia» and «Greece» or «Macedonians» and «Greeks». The writer's intention is to emphasise that the Macedonians had a completely separate nationality with their own language, Macedonian!!

To the present, a large number of Greek and foreign specialists have been decidedly concerned with the «problem» of the language and the nationality of the ancient Macedonians. Their Hellenism has by now been so convincingly proved³, that any discussion of the afore-

1. A. Angelopoulos has published an excellent review of the main points the 2nd and 3rd volumes in *Македоника* 11 (1971) 459-79.

2. For a better understanding of the Slavonic text I was greatly assisted by J. Papadrianos, research scholar at The Institute for Balkan Studies, to whom I express my gratitude.

3. Hatzidakis G., *Du caractère hellénisme des anciens Macedoniens*, Athens 1896. Idem, *Zur Abstammung der alten Makedonier. Eine Ethnologie studie*, Athen 1897. Idem, «Zur Ethno-

mentioned situation is superfluous. With this opportunity we bring to mind but a few ancient sources which dismiss any doubt concerning the Hellenism of the Macedonians. So, to begin with, we refer to the Father of History, Herodotus who identifies the Macedonians with the purest Greek race, the Dorians¹. The same historian adds that not only did they consider themselves as Greeks², but that the other Greeks believed the same of them³. As well, Polybios considers Macedonia a part of Greece and even more, he associates his Macedonian history with his complete history of Greece⁴. Furthermore, they were considered as Greeks by Strabo⁵, T. Livius⁶ and others. And, of the ancient writers, any who separate Macedonia «geographically» or «politically» from the main part of Greece, never forget to stress that this separation is neither racial nor national. For this reason they always speak about «Macedonia and the rest of Greece»⁷.

3) On p. 33, where mention is made of the founders of the Macedonian state, there is «systematic» silence about a very old, related, domestic tradition which Herodotus has preserved for us⁸. According to this, the Macedonian Argeades united with the Argeades from Argos in the Peloponnese who had common Doric origin. This very tradition was used by Alexander I to prove his Greek nationality and thereby to be accepted at the Olympic Games.

4) On p. 33 it is recorded that Perdikkas I reigned from 707-645 B. C. However, directly below, Argaios is mentioned as king in the years 659-645 B. C.; that is to say, from 659 until 645 (a full 14 years) we have dual kingship(?). Yet instances of dual kingship appear only in the Greek era.

5) Eordaia was not subject to Lower Macedonia, as is stated on p. 34, but to Upper⁹.

logie der alten Makedonier», *Indogerm. forschungen* 11 (1900) 313 ff. Idem, *Περὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ τῶν ἀρχαίων Μακεδόνων*, 1911, 87 ff. Hoffman O., *Die Makedonien, ihre Sprache und ihre Volkstum*, Göttingen 1906. Colocotronis V., *La Macédoine et l'Hellénisme*, Paris 1919. Ἀνδριώτη Ν., *Ἡ γλῶσσα καὶ ἡ ἑλληνικότητα τῶν ἀρχαίων Μακεδόνων*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1952. Δασκαλάκη Ἀπ., *Ἀρχαία Ἑλλάς καὶ Μακεδονικὸς Ἑλληνισμός*, Ἀθήναι 1952. Idem, *The Hellenism of the ancient Macedonians*, Thessaloniki 1965.

1. Herod. VIII, 43 «ἐόντες Δωρικὸν τε καὶ Μακεδνὸν ἔθνος ἐξ Ἑρνεοῦ τε καὶ Πίνδου καὶ Ἀρυσπίδος ὕστατα ὀρμηθέντες».

2. Cf. remarks of Alexander I to the Persian delegation: «...καὶ βασιλεῖ τῷ πέμψαντι ἀπαγγεῖλητε ὡς ἀνὴρ Ἑλλήν, Μακεδόνων ὑπαρχος, εὐ ὑμέας ἐδέξατο» (Herod. V, 20, 4).

3. Herod. V, 22, 1 «Ἑλλήνας δὲ τούτους εἶναι καθάπερ αὐτοὶ λέγουσι, αὐτὸς τε οὕτω τυγχάνω ἐπιστάμενος καὶ δὴ ἐν τοῖς ὀπισθε λόγοις ἀποδείξω ὡς εἰσι Ἕλληνες, πρὸς δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ διέποντες τὸν ἀγῶνα οὕτω ἔγνωσαν».

4. Polyb. VII, 9, 1 «ἐναντίον θεῶν πάντων ὅσοι Μακεδονίαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα κατέχουσιν».

5. Strabo II, 4, 8. VII, 7, I. VII, frag. 9 «ἔστι μὲν οὖν Ἑλλάς καὶ ἡ Μακεδονία· νυνὶ μέντοι τῇ φύσει τῶν τόπων ἀκολουθοῦντες καὶ τῷ σχήματι χωρὶς ἔγνωμεν αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἄλλης Ἑλλάδος». VIII, I, 1.

6. Liv. XXXI, 29.

7. Polyb. VII, 9, I. Strab. VII, frag. 9.

8. Herod. VIII, 137-139.

9. See Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece*, III, p. 316. Desdèvis-du-Dezert, *Géographie ancienne de la Macédoine*, Paris 1863, p. 327. Abel O., *Ἀρχαία Ἱστορία τῆς Μακεδονίας μέχρι τοῦ Φιλίππου* (μετάφρ. Μ. Δήμιτσα), Λειψία 1860, σ. 6. Δήμιτσα, *Γεωγραφία*, p. 598. Geyer Fr., article «Macedonia» in *RE*, XIV, col. 653. Κανατσούλη Δ., *Ἱστορία τῆς Μακεδονίας*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1964, σ. 4.

Furthermore, «west of Strymon and as far as Strymon» did not only extend Mygdonia and Bisaltia but also Krestonia (or Grestonia), which was located in the areas of Lakes Doirane and Butkov¹.

b) *The Relations with Greece and Persia in the 5th Century* (pp. 34-35).

1) On p. 34 the writer, in referring to Alexander the Great, says that «the title of Philhellene reveals that the followed a philhellenic policy». However, it is necessary to elucidate the meaning of the word in antiquity because the word «philhellene», which was sanctioned at the revolution of 1821 to characterise foreigners (Europeans) who nurtured amicable sentiments towards Greece, did not have the same meaning for ancient peoples. To them, the term was equivalent to that of «Panhellenic»². And exactly with this interpretation did Alexander I rule just as he with pride declared it to the Athenians³.

2) Alexander I did not exploit the period during which the Persians and the Athenians were involved in war to occupy new territory, as is reported on p. 34, because quite simply, in these numerous undertakings he himself participated with his army from the beginning till the battle at Plataiai⁴. Thus, the most natural thing would have been to exploit the confusion and disorder, provided by the retreat of the Persians after their defeat at Plataia in order to expand the borders of his state as far as the Strymon River. On the other hand the writer herself states that only «after the battle of Plataia was Macedonia liberated from the Persian yoke». But how is it that beforehand she herself referred to a Macedonian conquest before the battle at Plataia?

c) «*Social and political changes at the end of the 5th Cent. B. C.*» (pp. 36-38).

1) Despite her promise in the title which states that the writer will speak about political changes, finally, however, no mention is made of them.

2) Archelaos did not ascend the Macedonian throne in 418 B. C. but in 414-3 B. C. because Thucydides mentions his predecessor participating in events in the 16th⁵ and 15th⁶ years of the Peloponnesian war, that is in 415 and 414 B. C.

3) Of the reforms of Archelaos, the most important, which related to the division of Macedonia into civil districts⁷, is ignored. This even entailed a change in the manner of state administration.

d) «*Dynastic conflicts in the first half of the 4th Century B. C.*» (pp. 37-38).

1) Although this subchapter is entitled «Dynastic conflicts...» there is no mention of any conflict.

2) The personality of Perdikkas III (365-359 B. C.) is ignored. He, with his remarkable

1. Herod. VII, 124, 127. Thuc. II, 99, 6. 100, 4. Strabo IV, 331, frag. 41. Oberhummer, *RE*, XI col. 598. Κανατσούλη, *op. cit.*, σ. 4.

2. For additional information see Daskalakis, *The Hellenism of the ancient Macedonians*, Thessaloniki 1965, p. 201 ff.

3. Herod. IX, 45, 1. «Ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι.....οὐ γὰρ ἄν ἔλεγον, εἰ μὴ μεγάλως ἐκηδόμην συναπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος».

4. Herod. VII, 173, 3. VIII, 34, 121, 136, 137, 139-44. IX, 1, 4, 8, 44-6.

5. Thuc. VI, 7, 3-4.

6. *Ibid.*, VII, 9.

7. See Κανατσούλη, Ὁ Ἀρχέλαος καὶ αἱ μεταρρυθμίσεις τοῦ ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ, Θεσσαλονίκη 1948.

policy, succeeded in delivering Macedonia from the Thracian overlords, became the second king after Archelaos, and was a patron of letters in his court¹.

3) Amyntas III did not ascend the throne in 390 B. C., but in 393-2 B. C.².

4) The intervention of Pelopidas was not the only reason which compelled Alexander II to abandon Thessaly. There was another reason of equal seriousness: the revolution brought Alorites, the son-in-law of Ptolemy, to Macedonia³. Even Pelopidas exploited this very revolution in order to interfere in the internal affairs of Macedonia⁴.

e) «*The strengthening and expansion of the Macedonian state. Philip II 359-336 B. C.*» (pp. 38-42).

Concerning the panhellenic conference of Corinth, which is mentioned in this subchapter, we must note that although unessential details are included, those decisions which are basic and of world-historic importance are ignored. For example, the decision which was taken to commission the leadership of the army to Philip and the war conducted against the Persians, who were rightly considered enemies of «common peace». For carrying out this particular war, Philip was granted additional powers and the title «emperor of the army»⁵.

f) «*Alexander the Macedon 336-323 B.C.*» (pp. 42-45).

1) Even from the title of this subchapter, in which the name of Alexander is adorned with the surname «Macedonian», the effort of the writer to separate him from other Greeks is apparent. For this reason his title «the Great» is «intentionally» ignored—a title which history has justifiably granted to him and an attribute accepted without question by all contemporary historians⁶.

2) The campaign of Alexander the Great is presented as a purely Macedonian event. The panhellenic character of the campaign is overlooked and the fact that Alexander the Great acted as an agent of the conference at Corinth is ignored. Indeed, all Greeks apart from the Lacedaemonians, took part in his campaign.

3) Furthermore, the character of the above campaign is presented as clearly imperialistic, its civilising purpose being overlooked.

4) On pp. 44-45, although a considerable amount of space is devoted to an investigation of the political results of the campaign, an examination of the civilising results are overlooked, probably because the writer would then have also been obliged to refer to Hellenistic politics. Generally, Alexander the Great is presented as a common conqueror and not the great civiliser that he was.

g) «*The decline of the state of Alexander. The heirs and descendants*» (pp. 45-46).

1) The personality of Antipatros, who played such an important role in the history of Macedonia during this time, is entirely ignored⁷. The relations between Macedonia and the

1. Κανατσούλη, 'Ιστορία της Μακεδονίας, σ. 28.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 24. Cloché, *Histoire de la Macédoine*, p. 104.

3. Diod. XV, 61, 3-5. Κανατσούλη, *op. cit.*, 26.

4. *Ibid.*

5. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

6. Cf. Meller L., *Numismatique d'Alexandre le Grand*, Copenhagen 1885. Meyer, *Alexander der Grosse*, Halle 1910. Otto W., *Alexander der Grosse*, 1916. Willamowitz-Moellendorf, *Alexander der Grosse*, Berlin 1916. Tarn W., *Alexander the Great*, Cambridge I (1948), 2 (1950). Cloché P., *Alexandre le Grand*, Paris 1955, etc.

7. See Kanatsoulis D., *Antipatros, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Makedoniens in der Zeit Philipps, Alexanders und Diadochen*, München 1940.

other Hellenistic states are not mentioned at all neither is Macedonia's internal policy in this period.

2) At the time when Macedonia was Greek and, more especially in this period, was the bringer, like a lone bearer, of Greek civilisation, we read about «the dehellenisation of Macedonia».

3) And one geographical error!! Lamia was not to be found in northern Greece simply because Greece was Macedonia, as the ancient sources testify.

Several general criticisms

1) The intention of the chapter which we are criticising, as also that of the whole three-tomed History of Skopje is no more than this: to teach that from ancient times Macedonia constituted a separate nationality (decidedly not Greek!!). Hence, in order to support this «super-intention» irrelevant details are mentioned where they are not needed and essential historical facts are overlooked. For the same reason a «penetration» is attempted into meaningless, relative historical events while at the same time the chapter generally lacks scholastic depth. And more fundamentally, from the aspect of methodology: documentation is neglected in order to avoid censure.

2) We recognise that it is not a simple task to write a history of ancient Macedonia in a mere 15 pages. But if the writer has enough academic bearing to «summarise» this history of ancient Macedonia, she should have placed the problem of the summary on surer base and not to recourse to solving events in the simplest fashion or to confuse meaningless historical facts in descriptive display. Furthermore, she should not have attempted and undertaken those problems which even labour the specialists with so much lack of depth and without discussion.

3) Finally, the improvisation and the academic shortcomings which characterise this second chapter is highlighted by the poor bibliography (placed near the end of the first volume, pp. 329-330), in which we see that noteworthy historical sources are ignored (Arrianos, Aristotle, etc.). In addition, although many ancient writers are placed in the bibliography, they are not used well — we observed this in the criticism of the various subchapters —, unless they were not used but placed there for «decorative» reasons. The lack of relevant details excludes any judgement.

Once again, concerning recent publications, fundamental monographs of new scholars are ignored. We mention only a few which are recommended for the future issue of the History which the editorial commission speaks about in the Prologue (p. 8): Casson St., *Macedonia, Thrace and Illyria*, Oxford 1926. Geyer Fr., *Makedonien bis zur Thronbesteigung Philipps II*, München/Berlin 1930. Kanatsoulis D., *Antipatros, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Makedoniens in der Zeit Philipps, Alexanders und der Diadochen*, München 1940. Paribeni R., *La Macedonia sino Alessandro Magno*, Milano 1947. Κανατσούλη Δ., *Ὁ Ἀρχέλαος καὶ αἱ μεταρρυθμίσεις του ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1948. Cloché P., *Histoire de la Macédoine jusqu'à l'avènement d'Alexandre le Grand*, Paris 1960. Κανατσούλη Δ., *Ἡ Μακεδονία μέχρι τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Ἀρχελαίου. I. Ἐξωτερικὴ πολιτικὴ*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1964. Τοῦ ἰδίου, *Ἱστορία τῆς Μακεδονίας μέχρι τοῦ Μεγάλου Κωνσταντίνου*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1964. Daskalakis Ap., *The Hellenism of the ancient Macedonians*, Thessalonique 1965. Hammond N., *A History of Macedonia*, Oxford 1972.