

sula and the Lebanese coast. Rarely does van Effenterre justify the relevance of his musings to his readers. Here and there, a transitional sentence would have helped the cause of clarity. A coherent preface, or statement of intent, would have prepared the reader's expectations to the degree that one could relate the occasional offerings of specific archaeological finds (e.g. pp. 72-82, concerning Pylos and the Arkadia-Messenia coastal plain) to the general scheme of the author's intent.

A decent conclusion can oft remedy whatever clarity may be wanting in a learned work. Van Effenterre offers an *Epilogue* of fifteen pages which makes little reference to the body of his work and clearly contradicts his subtitle: He states that in the "... continuance of daily life,... the survival of the gods..., the permanence of institutions,...and the Homeric World...", the Mycenaean achievement survived whatever snuffed out its political independence.

Let me defend any scholar's right... indeed, his duty... to decline to choose from rival viewpoints if he believes insufficient evidence mandates caution. The study of history, especially of pre-industrial Europe, suffers from too many hasty generalizations. An author, however, has an obligation to his readers to state this lack of partisanship clearly, both at the beginning and at the end of the work. Professor van Effenterre clearly failed to warn us not to expect anything except disorganized rehashings and opaque musings.

On some controversial issues, van Effenterre has exercised his well-earned right to take a stance. Obviously, he accepts Michael Ventris' mathematical grid thesis for an attempted decipherment of "Linear B" (NOT "Linear A"). I belong to the small, embattled and unpublished minority which remain sceptical. Likewise, van Effenterre does not hesitate to conceive of a wide, voluminous network of Mycenaean trade routes stretching from southern Italy and Sicily to the Middle Egyptian Province, citing a few finds of potsherds in the specified locales. Such reasoning to me would allow a person to conclude a heavy commerce between Earth and Mars because two instrument packages now sit somewhere upon the "Red Planet". Interpretations of archaeological finds remain a most tricky task. If we address audiences beyond the ambit of professional colleagues, we must make clear the limitations of our data, even to the extent of apparent patronization at times. Otherwise, we risk retarding rather than increasing the understanding of history.

For these reasons, I cannot recommend Professor van Effenterre's book either to the specialist or to the general reader.

Southern Connecticut State College

STANLEY A. SUSSMAN

A.S. Šofman, *Vostočnaja Politika Aleksandra Makedonskogo* [The Eastern Policy of Alexander of Macedon] Kazan, Kazan University Press, 1976, pp. 520.

Few topics have attracted as much scholarly attention as the Eastern campaigns of Alexander of Macedon. Even in his time Alexander's deeds were either idealized and glorified or condemned and denigrated. Opinions about Alexander's epoch kept clashing throughout the Roman period and the Middle Ages. The East created the legend of Iskander, the conqueror of the world. "The Romance of Alexander" became popular in Byzantium, Russia and Western Europe. In our time Alexander has been the subject of numerous studies containing a variety of concepts elaborated by such eminent students of antiquity as Dreusen, Tarn, Wilcken, Cloche, Schachermier and others. The progress in the study of the origins of Hellenism has been considerable. With each new stage in the development of historical science this problem has been looking increasingly large. The concept of Alexander's epoch

as the period of "the supreme flourishing of Greece" is entirely justified at the present stage in the evolution of historical science. It should be pointed out that the elaboration of this concept has been generally completed: the first large monograph devoted to Alexander's eastern policy has made its appearance. In many respects it is unique in its field. The author, professor A.S. Shofman of Kazan State University, has long been working on the problems of ancient Macedonia, the history of Alexander's Eastern campaigns and his policies.

The new work is truly comprehensive. Two features of the book strike the reader's eye: the exhaustive critical analysis of the sources and the original composition of the monograph. The former feature results from the authors's approach to the works of Arrian, Plutarch, Diodorus, Justin, Curtius. Emphasizing the existence of two traditions (pro-Alexander and anti-Alexander), A.S. Shofman not only traces these traditions to particular sources but also explains the class and political causes of the conflicting treatments of Alexander's epoch in ancient historiography. This basic principle permits the author to differentiate his concept from various other theses. Not confining himself to the usual survey of European and American literature about Alexander, A. S. Shofman is always striving to evaluate the historians' opinions.

As for the composition of the monograph, it should be stressed that so far Alexander's Eastern policies had not been treated as a separate problem. As a rule, students of ancient history have viewed Alexander's epoch through the prism of this statesman's biography, who is usually described as "the Great". As a result, the history of the period all too frequently turned into another biography of Alexander with "digressions" into some other problems like his town-building programme, religious policy, etc. The military affairs have always been in the centre of historians' attention, often at the expense of all other problems.

A.S. Shofman breaks with this "traditional" approach (originated by Dreusen). His work has three large parts: part I, "Eastern campaigns" (dealing with the military matters); part II, "Undertakings, policies and ideas" (containing the analysis of Alexander's innovations in the East, administration of his empire, relations between him and his comrades-in-arms and, finally, of the plots against Alexander within his close environment); part III, "Anti-Macedonian movements" (dealing with the liberation struggle in various parts of Greece and of the East against the Macedonian oppressors). Hence it becomes clear why the author has chosen a problem approach. He dwells not so much on Alexander's personality (although it is given enough attention) as on the period itself in its various aspects—economic, military-political and social. "Soviet historians view the grand eastward march of Alexander's Greek-Macedonian troops in the light of the socio-economic processes which took place in the 4th century B.C...." (p. 509). This approach should be recognized as the only correct one and it permitted the author to solve many of the seemingly unsolvable problems.

It is a pity that the author left out the causation of Alexander's Eastern campaigns. Naturally the author is fully entitled to limit the scope of his work, particularly in view of the fact that this problem was thoroughly investigated in A.S. Shofman's earlier monograph and papers, as well as in the articles of other students of antiquity. And yet, the monograph would be more comprehensive if it included the discussion of the causes of the Eastern campaigns.

Much space in the book is devoted to the analysis of the military history of the period, i.e. of the Eastern expedition of Alexander of Macedon. A.S. Shofman is the first Soviet author to give a detailed analysis of the sources concerning Alexander's major battles, beginning with the battle of Granik and ending with his Indian campaign and return to Babylon. The author is not a specialist in military history but his conclusions on a number of issues appear well-founded and competent. While evaluating the battle of Granik A.S. Shof-

man proves the soundness of F. Engels' tenets about the importance of tactical maneuvers and the role of the attack in the Macedonian victory (pp. 51-52). In his analysis of the battle of Issa the author succeeds in reconstructing the battle, drawing not only on the standard sources but also on Polybius. A.S. Shofman writes, "The battle of Issa greatly affected the course of the war. Persia's difficult position changed the balance of power in favour of the Macedonian conquerors" (p. 77). The method of restoring the siege of Tyre is noteworthy. A.S. Shofman has convincingly demonstrated that Greek superiority was the cause of the hard-won but momentous victory at Tyre. Most attention is given to the battle of Guagamela which was "one of the most difficult and decisive ones in the whole of Alexander's Eastern campaign" (p. 101). The author gives a most detailed analysis of the sources and a generally correct reconstruction of the battle adducing the proofs of the cavalry's role in the victory (cf. K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, vol. 14, p. 16). Finally, in the description of the military affairs the section devoted to the Indian expedition is especially worthy of attention. This phase of the Eastern campaigns has been studied insufficiently and A.S. Shofman was the first to consider a number of relevant questions, e.g. the changing of Macedonian tactics in view of "the elephant attack".

It would be hard to mention all the new ideas put forward by the author. However it should be pointed out that apart from the above-mentioned problems the author has also investigated Alexander's diplomacy, which was closely connected with his military activities.

Breaking up the Eastern campaigns into periods presents certain problems. The author distinguishes three large stages: 1) The conquest of Asia Minor and of the East Mediterranean countries; 2) Subjugation of the Persian lands; 3) March into the Eastern satrapies. Each of these stages is, in its turn, subdivided into smaller periods and events. The warfare is presented as an objective logical process governed by its peculiar laws and marked by contradictions. The author successfully combines the logic of history with the drama of history. The pictures of battles, sieges and troop movements appeal not only to the reader's mind but also to his imagination. Suffice it to mention the vivid description of the Macedonian army's return from India to Babylon across the deserts of Beluchistan (pp. 152ff). Such descriptions are typical of A.S. Shofman's monograph and are generally characteristic of the author's style.

As for the novelty of the author's conclusions, it is most pronounced in the parts dealing with the various aspects of Alexander's eastern policy and with the resistance to this policy within various sections of the Macedonian army and among the native peoples of the occupied countries. It is these problems that in the words of the author constitute the basis and the essence of his monograph.

A.S. Shofman rightly says that "among the vast literature on the Eastern campaigns there is not a single work dealing specifically with the problem of administration in the huge empire of Alexander of Macedon" (p. 161). Attempting this specific analysis the author put forward a number of well-grounded theses. In the first place, he proved that Alexander had not had and could not have had any definite plan of organizing his Empire. Secondly, he demonstrated that the forms of administration had differed greatly in different territories (the author distinguishes three administration types: a) in Greece, Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt; b) in Iran and Mesopotamia; c) in the Far Eastern satrapies). Thirdly, it is suggested that "already in Alexander's time the basis of the future bureaucratic systems of the Hellenic states was laid down" (p. 188).

Alexander's town-building programme can be considered as an aspect of his administrative policies. It is viewed by A.S. Shofman as being essentially different from that of the

Ahemnid dynasty (p. 188). The problem is again posed in such a way as to establish not only what towns Alexander founded but also how the programme evolved. The study of the foundation of Alexandria in Egypt is of particular interest. "The number of towns built by Alexander is not known exactly", writes A.S. Shofman, "Plutarch attributes the foundation of 70 towns to him. This testimony should be treated with caution, since it appears to be exaggerated" (p. 198). This statement seems reasonable, although, in our opinion, the question remains open.

While clarifying the functions of the towns founded in the East A.S. Shofman refutes the opinions of bourgeois historians who usually take too narrow a view of the problem. The author regards the towns as economic, strategic and administrative centres (pp. 206-208). The attempts to locate individual towns appear somewhat more debatable. After presenting the available archaeological data, the author expresses hope that future discoveries will shed new light on this and other problems. The questions posed in the book are likely to stimulate archaeological research.

A number of Alexander's measures (the deification of his person, the introduction of oriental customs, the employment of Persians in the administration, intermarriage, etc.) are regarded by A.S. Shofman as attempts to find social support for the new state of whose instability "Alexander was fully aware" (p. 222). Of particular interest is the study of Alexander's deification in the Ammon Temple in Egypt. This event is rightly judged as Alexander's unsuccessful attempt to deify his rule.

A.S. Shofman is critical of the concept of W. Tarn and some other historians according to which Alexander of Macedon aimed at creating "the brotherhood of man". "The principal and cherished ambition of Alexander was world domination", writes the author disputing Tarn's assertion that Alexander never wanted to be the master of the world (p. 246).

On the other hand, the author is far from trying to simplify the truly complicated problem. He takes issue with those historians who attribute undue importance to Alexander's idea of world domination (e.g. F. Alheim, F. Schachermeir and others). These historians do not seem to be aware of the evolution of Alexander's idea of world domination, believing that it appeared in its final form in the very beginning of the Eastern campaigns. The present investigation, however, shows convincingly that the idea evolved in stages which are closely followed by A.S. Shofman. He writes that this idea "was absent from the original plan of the Eastern campaigns. The conquest of Persia, which became possible after a number of decisive victories over the Persian armies, resulted in the conquest of Asia. The idea of world domination acquired its final form during the Indian campaign when the boundaries to be reached, investigated and conquered were traced out..." (p. 278).

A.S. Shofman raises a number of extremely important questions concerning Alexander's army and the opposition to the king both within the high command and among the ranks. The structure and the strength of the army are thoroughly investigated and the first ever numerical estimates are made of the changes in the composition of the army as it progressed to the East. A.S. Shofman demonstrates that "Greeks, barbarians and mercenaries constituted a majority among the troops joining the Macedonian king's armies in the East" (p. 293). Of great interest are the author's statistics obtained from the analysis of various sources and proving the tendency towards increasing barbarization of the Greek-Macedonian army.

Before proceeding to the analysis of the causes and manifestations of opposition in Alexander's army, the author gives detailed characteristics of Alexander's associates. Alexander's closest environment is described and it is shown that the victories in the East were due not only to the "great" Alexander but to a cohort of outstanding military and political leaders

of Macedonia and Greece as well. The book contains a vivid portrayal of Alexander's political opponents.

A study of the processes involved in the appearance and the evolution of the opposition to Alexander is in itself very complicated. Yet, it is the parts devoted to this study that are among the most successful. The culmination of the analysis is the author's attempt to solve the mystery of Alexander's early death. A. S. Shofman shares the most objective view, according to which the assertions that Alexander was poisoned are not without foundation and that the king in all likelihood did fall victim to a carefully prepared plot led by Antipater (pp. 388-403). Despite the controversial character of this claim, it is worth most serious attention, the more so because in bourgeois historiography this theory is generally rejected.

The final important problem investigated by A.S. Shofman is that of the anti-Macedonian movements among the subjugated peoples of Greece and of the East. Here the author is true to his general principle—which proved so effective in the analysis of the other problems—that of studying a phenomenon in its evolution. The monograph presents a panorama of three major stages of the anti-Macedonian movement: a) in the Mediterranean area; b) in Central Asia; c) in the Far Eastern satrapies. Drawing on the fragmentary data from the original sources A. S. Shofman succeeds in re-creating an impressive picture of the determined resistance offered by the oppressed peoples to the Macedonian conquerors. A.S. Shofman justly states that "the Macedonian conqueror's expedition was not all roses" and that "his armies had to overcome great obstacles in their conquest of the eastern lands" (p. 405). Of particular importance is the author's comprehensive treatment of the anti-Macedonian movement in Central Asia with Spitamen at the head. A.S. Shofman puts forward a number of ideas thus far not encountered in Soviet historical literature. He gives a detailed picture of the uprising of the peoples of Central Asia against foreign domination showing Spitamen as the leader of the popular movement and dealing at length with the causes of the insurgents' defeat. One cannot but agree with the evaluation of the uprising in Central Asia as an important landmark in the history of the local tribes' and nationalities' struggle for independence. This uprising "contributed to the undermining of Alexander's monarchy and the liberation movement of the peoples of Central Asia which ended in a victory nearly a hundred years later" (p. 492).

On the whole, the treatment and the systematic analysis of the problems in A.S. Shofman's monograph "The Eastern Policy of Alexander of Macedon" and the author's historicism produce a favourable impression. Needless to say, there can be other treatments and evaluations of the problems involved and they will, no doubt, make their appearance. Nevertheless, the set of ideas put forward by A.S. Shofman is well-grounded and comprehensive.

The monograph is not without its minor drawbacks relating to the book's design rather than its contents. It is completely lacking in illustrations and addenda (indexes, maps, chronological tables, etc.). This certainly makes the book inconvenient to use. There are also some errors which, however, are not numerous for such a voluminous work. These imperfections are too insignificant to affect the value of the first large Soviet monograph devoted to "Alexander's epoch". It is certain to arouse interest on the part of students of history and of the more general public.

DIMITRIOS TOUSLIANOS