B 20953

GNOMON

KRITISCHE ZEITSCHRIFT
FÜR DIE GESAMTE
KLASSISCHE ALTERTUMSWISSENSCHAFT

93. BAND

Sonderdruck

HEFT 6

VERLAG C.H.BECK MÜNCHEN

Adolfo J. Domínguez (Ed.): *Politics, Territory and Identity in Ancient Epirus*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS 2018. XIV, 337 S. zahlr. Abb. (Diabaseis. 8.) 38 €.

This volume brings together current research on, and different methodological approaches to, the study of ancient Epirus. It is a book for specialists, since most of the articles are quite detailed and assume some prior understanding on the part of the reader; seven of the nine chapters cohere well with each other, all circling around the development and relationship of political organizations (villages, *poleis*, *koina*), religious sites, and urban structures. A chapter on linguistics fits less well here, although it emphasizes the fundamentally Greek nature of Epirote ethnics; and the last chapter on travelers reminds us of where, and how, modern investigations started.

In the first chapter, 'New Developments and Tradition in Epirus: The Creation of the Molossian State' (1–41), A. J. Domínguez defends the long-held view that a Molossian state was created in the late fifth or early fourth century BC. The evidence for this has always been thin, but the author adds to it an analysis of the recent archaeological finds in the plain of Ioannina, arguing that new settlements there at the end of the fifth century are actually villages that should be called demes, on the Attic model. Four of these he identifies as «administrative centers» (16) where *damiourgoi* «exercised authority» (19), *damiourgos* being the title given to ten men in the only Molossian inscription whose contents, two acts granting *politeia* to two women and their descent-lines, can indubitably be dated to the fourth century BC. This Athenian-inspired reform is the fundamental change that created the Molossian *koinon*, jumpstarted the Molossian economy, and counted as a mark of voluntary power-sharing by the kings, as noted by Aristotle. Domínguez's other change to the traditional model is to posit resistance to this change that was quieted only after king Alketas' return from exile in 384, by the oath between king and 'Epeirotes' in 'Molossian' Passaron, as reported by Plutarch.

The suggestion of demes and the association of *damiourgoi* with them are appealing, but based on very little. For three of the four new 'demes' little supporting evidence is provided; only the fourth, Rachi Platanias, has a «public building» whose «monumental character» is, by the mid-fourth century, indicated by rooftiles stamped with a lightning bolt, a «symbol linked to Dodona and Molossia» that confirms the building's religious and administrative function (8). This is the only evidence for Domínguez's idea of a 'deme' and he must use it repeatedly (12 n. 36; 16; 22–3). But at least one archaeologist thinks the rooftiles date later than the fourth century BC (8 n. 22), and the most recent summary of this evidence in English[1] classifies the four newer settlements as villages (*komai*) that are mostly clusters of farmhouses (139), dates the Rachi Platanias settlement to the late classical/early Hellenistic period (137), and identifies the building with the rooftiles as a temple that also functioned as a treasury (138). There is no evidence at all for «administrative centers» or for the political role of the *damiourgoi*, who, Domínguez admits, are also likely to have played an important role in the festival (at Dodona) of Zeus Naios (23, 26).

[1] G. Pliakou, 'The Basin of Ioannina in Central Epirus, Northwestern Greece, from the Early Iron Age to the Roman Period', Archaeological Reports 64 (2017–2018) 133–51.

DOI: 10.17104/0017-1417-2021-6-522

My verdict on the second chapter is more positive, but with reservations. J. Pascual's 'From the Fifth Century to 167 B.C.: Reconstructing the History of Ancient Epirus' argues (43-99) that the Molossians and their kings unified *all* of Epirus in the first half of the fourth century, leaving the pre-existing *koina* of the Molossians, Chaonians, and Thesprotians intact as «the basis of the kingdom's administration» (88). He examines the implications of the *theorodokoi* lists for Epirus, refuting the long-held opinion that cities or groups that appear there must be entirely independent states and that cities or groups that do not appear had been subsumed and politically extinguished by a larger political entity (45-54), and argues that Queen Kleopatra as *theorodoka* of 'Apeiros' was queen of a state – «a unified Epirus under a monarchic regime» (53). This theory of a unified Epirus is then buttressed by his rejection of a phase of 'Epirote symmachy'. Indeed, a unified Epirus had existed a long time; Pascual dates its formation to the time of the Illyrian incursion (385/4), when, he argues, other Epirotes accepted Molossian leadership as a form of protection (70–1).

The arguments made against two elements of the standard view are compelling. There is no need to posit a phase of 'Epirote *symmachia*' in the last third of the fourth century, nor to accept the political extinction of the Thesprotians in it (63); and the resistance to over-interpretation of the *theorodokoi* lists is also laudable. But the removal of these two suppositions does not make Pascual's positive case for him. Interpreting every appearance of 'Epirus' as referring to a united kingdom of the three major 'states' of the Northwest smooths over many difficulties of interpreting terms in ancient literary sources, and he does not confront the unmistakable fact that the Molossians and their kings, allegedly the drivers of voluntary unification because they could provide protection to their neighbors, were weak throughout much of the fourth century, their kingdom even subject to Macedonian occupation towards its end. Many assumptions are also made on the basis of slim evidence: that *theorodokoi* should be considered *prostatai* of political entities (52), that *prostatai* require the existence of an *ekklesia* (59), or that 'Epirus' always means the entirety of the Northwest as defined under Pyrrhus, when the term could be a geographic name given by outsiders (as Filos notes later, 287 n. 8) without a constitutional foundation. The treatment of some details is also questionable: e.g., the interpretation of the Dodona *lamella* DVR 3977A cannot be correct (61-2), for ΑΠΟΡΕΙΤΑΝ is not the genitive plural ethnic Ἀπειροτᾶν, but more likely the dual optative present of ἀπορέω, 'may the two of them be without options', an answer rather than a question. So although a thesis of an early, united Epirus is bold and thought-provoking, more careful work needs to be done to establish a plausible case.

In the third chapter, 'Polis and Dependency in Epirus' (101–34), Soledad Milán studies the settlements in the area (between the Acheron River and the territory of Ambracia) known as Cassopaea. These were Bouchetion, Elateia, Pandosia, Batiae, and Cassopa (or Cassopē) itself. The first three were referred to as independent *poleis* 'in Kassopeia' with their own territory in a pseudo-Demosthenic speech (7.32) about Philip II's conquests, to which list (and in the same historical context) Theopompus adds the fourth, Batiae; these four were given by Philip to the Molossian king. The earliest reference to (simple) 'Kassopa' seems to be in the *theorodokoi* list from 356/5, where it appears along with Pandosia. Milán would

DOI: 10.17104/0017-1417-2021-6-522

like to push the foundation of Cassopē back to the fifth century on the basis of a Dodona *lamella* (DVC 363A, Κασ(σ)οπ[αῖοι]), but even if the restoration is correct, many datings of DVC are recognized to be too early and this ethnic is unlikely to refer to the city itself, since archaeologically the settlement begins at the earliest in the second decade of the fourth century (106), and the creation of the *polis* itself (rather than just a settlement) is dated to 350 BC (119 n. 93); Rinaldi in chapter 7 of this volume dates this development even later (267).

Milán argues that the five *poleis* were linked politically (123). She considers three options: all participated in a federal structure (*koinon*) headed by Cassopē; all belonged to a politically insignificant *ethnos*; or all 'Cassopaeans' were only citizens of Cassopē, and the other *poleis*, as cities 'of Cassopaeans', were therefore dependencies of Cassopē. For a *koinon* there is no evidence. Milán's preference, that the *poleis* were dependencies of Cassopē, is a difficult case to make: it means that even when handed over to the Molossians in 342, these four *poleis* and their territory were not «separated from Cassopaea and the Cassopaeans» (126), i.e., were still in the territory controlled by Cassopē itself. The third option is actually the best: Pseudo-Scylax (*Per.* 31) did refer to the peoples who lived in villages in this area as 'Cassopaea, an *ethnos*': this could have been the group, called Cassopa, that hosted *theoroi*, and could have continued to exist as an *ethnos* under this name without the other *poleis*. All the people who lived in this area were Cassopaeans, and from them the city of Cassopē would take its name; after the four *poleis* were handed over to Molossia, the rest (except for the developing *polis* of Cassopē) lived in villages.

A proverbial expression, to chatter continuously like 'the Dodonan bronze', inspired lexicographers to identify the dedications in that shrine that made such noise. One insisted that there was a circle of bronze tripods surrounding Zeus' shrine, which when touched vibrated noisily; others described a dedication consisting of two columns, one with a youth holding a whip, the other with a hollow vessel, and when the wind blew the whip struck the vessel and sound ensued. Maria Intrieri in the fourth chapter ('L'isola, l'*epeiros* e il santuario: una riflessione sull'*anathema* corcirese a Dodona', 135–69) dissects the layers of lexicographical assertions, including the timing of the introduction into these traditions of a second proverbial expression, 'the Corcyraean whip' as a symbol of wealth and arrogance, and suggests that the second (columnar) assemblage was put together from actual but disparate parts, one an existing Corcyraean dedication of the whip-bearing boy, the other a dedicated vessel of the type from which lots were drawn; these two were combined to replace the sounds made by the circle of (now-decayed?) tripods, the boy perhaps refigured as a pastoral youth who used his whip to drive animals (148–51). This is all highly learned and happily hypothetical, but offers a welcome attempt at historical contextualization for a famous, no longer extant monument.

Jessica Piccinini examines relations between oracular sanctuaries in the fifth chapter (171–92). H. W. Parke had long assumed that oracles were 'rivals', but a careful examination of the evidence, almost entirely literary, shows that this was not the case. The most famous examples of testing more than two oracles to see which one had the 'right' answer were (in the cases of Croesus and Mardonius) Greek stories of improperly skeptical foreigners, while the third (the Thebans

before Leuktra) reflects only a Boeotian «obsession» with oracles (176). Double consultations were actually quite normal (176–8), a way of seeking reassurance. Oracles also founded oracles, establishing a kind of pedigreed family relationship from which both parties profited (179–86). Competition was created not by the oracles themselves, but by aristocracies and political entities who made the sanctuaries into arenas of competition (187). All this does not mean, however, that oracles in some sense «cooperated»: rather, there was «a tacit plan of non-disruption» that maintained the prestige and authority of all oracles.

In the first part of a chapter on Chaonian territories and sacred landscapes ('Territori e paesaggi sacri nella Caonia ellenistica e romana', 193–247), Sandro De Maria surveys settlement patterns of this area: a handful of *poleis* – Butrint, Phoenikē, Antigoneia (before 167), and Hadrianopolis – accompanied by numerous fortified villas in the countryside. He then summarizes which divinities are known to have been worshipped where. The *poleis* provide the most evidence, especially Butrint, although De Maria is doubtful about a cult of Athena here, and adds the significant observation, based on unpublished excavation (199 n. 39), that there was *no* temple of Athena at Phoenikē, the city long thought to be the source of a question to the oracle at Dodona about moving her temple (LOD 11). Less archaeological attention to the countryside could account for this skewed distribution. In the second part of this co-authored chapter, Lorenzo Mancini identifies two Greek cultic systems at play in the area, one that was «other» and «urban» (but is here mostly explored through the mythical configurations of coasts and settlements along maritime routes), and one that was «autochthonous» and organized according to radically different social-cultural codes (203). Mancini then suggests that the settlements served, in aggregate, to protect the interior of the *ethnos*' territory, while the cities were surprisingly «permeable» to rural cult (Pan at Butrint, Artemis at Phoenikē). At the cultic level, a parallel to this pattern is provided by Athena Polias, whose temple was the subject of that Dodona *lamella* and where the questioner was «the *polis* of the Chaonians»: *polis* here is metaphorical and Athena is the armed protectress of «the center», defending the integrity of the *ethnos* (225). Cults in small settlements fulfill a similarly communitarian goal not compatible with the world of the *polis* (226).

In 'I luoghi della vita politica e amministrativa nelle città dell'Epiro' Elia Rinaldi's focus is on administrative buildings (around 20) and *agorai* (six) in Hellenistic Epirus (249–82). The growth of self-governing cities is a phenomenon of the late fourth and (especially) third centuries, with intensified building or remodelling of these two types of structure in the late third, at Antigonea, Phoenikē, Butrint, Gitana, Elea, and Cassopē. Only Butrint and Phoenikē survive the Roman cataclysm of 167 with *agorai* that continue to expand and monumentalize (252-6). The identification of *agorai* is in part dependent on the identification of political or administrative buildings, and some spaces of governance (gymnasia, theaters, private houses) were clearly multifunctional. Even more challenging is drawing distinctions between city governments and the government of *ethnos* or *koinon*. Rinaldi finds evidence of local governance at Antigoneia, Gitana, Cassopē, Elea, and Phoenikē, especially in the late third century; these *poleis*, formed through the voluntary embrace of city life by small *ethnē*, sometimes also functioned as centers for these *ethnē*. *Poleis*, local *koina*,

DOI: 10.17104/0017-1417-2021-6-522

great ethnic *koina* (Molossians, Chaonians, Thesprotians), and the Epirote *koinon* all coexisted and governed, each at its own distinct level. *Poleis* and *koina* retained their own practices for the manumission of slaves and the granting of honors; the Epirote *koinon* may have reserved to itself the right to grant minting privileges, while stamped tiles with both city and tribal monograms suggest control of production at a level greater than that of a single city, the seals from Building A at Gitana are evidence of the intermingling of political, economic, and juridical business throughout Epirus, and bronze disks stamped with the monogram of the Epirote *koinon* found at both Gitana and Dodona attest, he argues, to «common law courts» throughout the League (269).

These seven chapters return time and again to many of the same themes. One wishes that they had talked to each other more, since interesting contradictions arise that can be usefully explored. What is the timing of 'urbanization' in Epirus? Suggestions run from the fifth to the second century. What is meant by 'urbanization'? Farmhouses, settlements, villages, *komai*, fortifications, *poleis*, cities are all terms used, but seemingly always meaning something a little different, and some authors are more inclined to assign political autonomy and self-governance to smaller conurbations than others. And even if it looks like a city, is it a *polis*? What makes a state? Assumptions are also made about the political implications of the term *koinon*, without an awareness of how small a *koinon* can be, right down to the level of τῶν συγγόνων (SEG XXIV 474) – that is, a group of relatives – or a single family. Given that there is emphasis (especially in De Maria and Mancini) on the way unusual Epirote settlement patterns interlock *and* differ from what is seen further to the south, and that this might shape the cultic landscape, one might wonder whether the settlement patterns also shape the political landscape in unusual ways, indeed can shape the very idea of what political life in Epirus might be, and that it might be different from how 'politics' to the south actually work. For all questions of political and religious life in Epirus, it is becoming apparent that the older approaches, through (mostly) exiguous literary sources, are simply inadequate, and that archaeological evidence will continue to make us rethink not only events and causation but indeed the very categories in which we think.

The last two chapters do not participate so much in these issues. Panagiotis Filos studies 'Linguistic Aspects of Epirote Ethnics' (283–301). He structures his investigation around a comparison of the eleven 'major' Epirote ethnics (such as Molossians, Cassopaeans and the like) and some of the 'minor' ethnics found at Bouthrotos (where 102 are known). The focus is on etymology (for six of the major ethnics, unclear; for the minor, more easily identifiable) and morphology (for both groups, simple nouns, compound nouns, suffixed forms, and double-suffixed forms). The most easily understandable ethnics from simple nouns are those built on places, whether 'living next to mountains' (Paroraioi) or 'living in a place with alders' (Klathrioi), and those derived from hero names; the major ethnic names built on geographic terms are likely to be most «etymologically safe» (294). He concludes that many of the tribal names have etymologically Greek derivations and use well-known Greek suffixes; it may be the greater age of the tribal ethnics that dictates their lack of linguistic transparency in comparison to those from

Bouthrotos. These observations strike me as eminently sensible and admirably accessible to the non-linguist.

In the final chapter (303–13), Gloria Mora wanders the Northwest with early travellers, particularly those interested in the archaeology and topography of the area: Leake, Pouqueville, Heuzey, Daumet, Gaultier de Chaubry. All exercised their native curiosity in exploring an area under Turkish rule and, in their eyes (at least initially), far from Greek civilization. Almost all misidentified most of the remains while nonetheless describing with a fair degree of accuracy what they could see, which makes them still valuable (and occasionally delightful, as anyone who has dipped into these authors knows) witnesses to the countryside and the preservation of monuments. Mora also restores to his rightful place Christopher Wordsworth, nephew of the poet, as the first to identify the site of Dodona in 1832–33. By reminding us of who went before, this chapter serves as a proper *envoi* for the entire book.

Charlottesville *Elizabeth A. Meyer*

*

Paul McKechnie, Jennifer A. Cromwell (Edd.): *Ptolemy I and the Transformation of Egypt, 404–282 BCE*. Leiden/Boston: Brill 2018. XI, 247 S. 25 Abb. (Mnemosyne. Suppl. 415.).

Zu Beginn des 4. Jh. v. Chr. hatte Ägypten nach der über ein Jahrhundert andauernden ersten Perserherrschaft (526[1]–404 v. Chr.) eben seine Unabhängigkeit wiedererlangt. Das Handeln der Herrscher der nun aufeinanderfolgenden 28.–30. Dynastie (404–342[2] v. Chr.) war einerseits auf die Sicherung des Landes vor weiteren Invasionsversuchen der Perser ausgerichtet. Andererseits, und das gilt insbesondere für die Könige der 30. Dynastie, mussten sie sich als legitime Herrscher präsentieren. Durch ein umfangreiches Tempelbauprogramm demonstrierten sie ihr gottgefälliges Auftreten und garantierten die göttliche Ordnung ('Maat') – eine der Hauptaufgaben pharaonischen Handelns; realpolitisch betrachtet konnten sie sich auf diesem Wege der Unterstützung der Priester versichern. Schließlich gelang es den Persern aber, Ägypten für eine kurze Dauer erneut unter ihre Kontrolle zu bringen (zweite Perserherrschaft, 342–332 v. Chr.).[3] Mit der Einnahme des Landes (oder, je nach Lesart, der Befreiung) durch Alexander den Großen im Jahr 332 v. Chr. wurde die makedonische Herrschaft eingeläutet, die durch die gut 40-jährige Regierungszeit von Ptolemaios, Sohn des Lagos, (zunächst als Satrap, dann als König Ptolemaios I., bis 282 v. Chr.) gar den Beginn einer der langlebigsten Herrscherdynastien in der Geschichte, eben der Ptolemäer, markiert.

[1] Siehe J.F. Quack, 'Zum Datum der persischen Eroberung Ägyptens unter Kambyses', in: Journal of Egyptian History 4, 2011, 228–246.

[2] Siehe zum Datum F. Payraudeau, 'L'Égypte et la vallée du Nil. Tome 3. Les époques tardives (1069–332 av. J.-C.)', Paris 2020, 342–344.

[3] Den wohl aktuellsten Überblick über die politische Entwicklung dieser Zeit bietet Payraudeau, a.O., 303–352; vgl. des Weiteren S. Ruzicka, 'Trouble in the West. Egypt and the Persian Empire, 525–332 BCE', Oxford Studies in Early Empires, Oxford 2012; A. Wojciechowska, 'From Amyrtaeus to Ptolemy. Egypt in the Fourth century B.C.', Philippika 97, Wiesbaden 2016.

DOI: 10.17104/0017-1417-2021-6-522