

на колониите на Тасос се одличен извор за односите меѓу метрополата и нејзините колонии – Галепсос, Ојсима, Неаполис, тасоската пераја и Филипи како полис, а потоа и како римска колонија. Од сите нив, иконографијата на монетите на Неаполис се разликува од другите, а и монетите на Неаполис се помалку застапени во наодите од француските ископувања на островот. Напротив, иако Кренида мошне брзо по основањето паднала под македонска власт и била преоснована како Филипи, во иконографијата на монетите на тасоската пераја и на Филипи јасно се гледа врската со Тасос. Последната статија во зборникот се однесува на епиграфијата, поточно на *написите од Алики на Тасос* (433–450), за кои пишува Ив Гранжан. Во трутот се претставени седум куси натписи, зачувани целосно или во фрагменти, најдени на полуостровот Алики на југоисточниот дел на островот. Шест од нив се врежани на блокови, преупотребени во една од двете базилики што го замениле паганскиот храм во ранохристијанско време; последниот натпис, најден во северозападниот дел на островот, се смета за *pierre errante* и треба да се поврзе со претходните шест. Оваа мала збирка содржи молитва за добра пловидба и четири посвети по повод патувањата на полисните службеници околу островот. Релјефот на Херакле, кој се наоѓа на една од овие посвети, можеби значи дека храмот што бил изграден на полуостровот кусо време по доаѓањето на колонистите не бил посветен само на Аполон.

Ова е, во куси прти, содржината на зборникот „Тасос. Метропола и колонии“, којшто искрено му го препорачуваме на секој специјалист. Ефектите од доцнењето на неговото издавање речиси воопшто не се чувствуваат, зашто прикажаните синтези имаат потрајна вредност, која не се менува со последните археолошки ископувања; освен тоа, кај поголемиот дел од трудовите се забележува дека авторите ги обновиле текстовите и ја искористиле можноста да понудат значително збогатени верзии на нивните првични текстови, проширени и со наоди од последната деценија. За крај, треба да се истакне дека трудовите во зборникови случајно не се наменети само како израз на почит кон ценетата колешка и соработничка Марина Згуру; нивната природа, се чини, е многу повеќе од парадна и свечена. Станува збор за сериозни, детални и високо стручни текстови кои на најубав начин ја исполнуваат надежта на приредувачот Доминик Мује – дека овој том, на некој начин, ќе значи чекор напред во истражувањата на Тасос. Можеби е точно дека не секој античар ќе најде во него нешто блиску до сопствениот интерес; но, за секој истражувач на Тасос, тракомакедонското крајбрежје и северот на Егејскиот басен, овој зборник мора да претставува неодминливо четиво.

Војислав Саракински  
Филозофски факултет

C. J. KING, *Ancient Macedonia*, London – New York: Routledge, 2017. pp. xxi, 307.

This is the first narrative history of ancient Macedonia after nearly three decades, and as such will create interest not only among scholars, but the general public as well. As C. King point out in the Preface, the aim is a general account on the rise and fall of the Macedonian monarchy, an account that is both informative and explorative and would be simultaneously useful for undergraduates, graduate students, scholars as well as the general public.

The book is divided in ten chapters: (1) Early Macedonia (1-23); (2) Macedonia and the Argead monarchy in the fifth century (24-48); (3) Macedonian succession and survival, 399-360 (49-69); (4) Philip II, 360-336: consolidation and expansion (70-106); (5) Macedonian military (107-130); (6) Alexander III and Macedonia, 356–334 (131-150); (7) Alexander and the Macedonians beyond Macedonia, 334–323 (151-177); (8) Antipater and the early wars of the Successors, 334–319 (178-204); (9) Between dynasties, 319–279: wars of the Successors (205-234); (10) The Antigonids, the Greek Leagues, and Rome, 278–167 (235-268).

As can be seen, the division is more or less conventional and follows the chronological order, the exception being the fifth chapter. Indeed, considering the rest of the book, the fifth chapter is a somewhat awkward addition to the narrative, yet at the same time quite revealing concerning the author's focus and attention. There are no chapters dedicated to the Macedonian state, its economy, administration, functioning of the cities, not to mention art, culture or religious beliefs. Admittedly, there are a number of passing references to some of these questions but they are too few and far in between to allow the reader to form a clear picture on these issues. This is first and foremost a political and military history of ancient Macedonia, which is in some ways unfortunate since the study of ancient Macedonia encompasses a far wider range of inquiries than just political and military problems.<sup>9</sup>

Perhaps K. feels that these various questions have been satisfactorily presented in the two recent *Companions* to Ancient Macedonia, where the focus was less on political history.<sup>10</sup> Be that as it may, can this book, despite its restricted subject, be seen as a useful guide for the political history of ancient Macedonia and a valuable addendum to the two afore mentioned *Companions*? I will attempt to offer an answer based on three points – (1) the methodological approach to various problems; (2) the thematic approach and division of the whole book; and (3) the errors found in the book.

1. Let us start with the case of Alexander's famous nocturnal visit before the battle of Plataea. Obviously there is no consensus on the matter, nor is that the point here – K. is free to posit that the episode is historical just as much as the next one who will deny it. The problem is the exposition. K. accepts the story because Alexander had good reasons for playing both sides, and because history is full of daring episodes (29). This is perfectly acceptable as a theoretical model, however the issue is not whether it was possible, but as K. herself points out, whether it was plausible. Additionally, the problem is greater than just a plausibility of a night visit – there are various issues within Herodotus' description that seem suspicious,<sup>11</sup> not to mention the issue of correlation between Alexander's visit and the obviously pro-Athenian description of the events, including the puzzling maneuvers before the battle.<sup>12</sup> Therefore we are not dealing with a simple dichotomy belief – disbelief or possible – impossible, as one might get the impression from King's argumentation. Since, as mentioned before, the book is not intended only, or even primarily, for the specialists, but rather a more general public (x), we should not expect a detailed analysis of every single problem and that is perfectly acceptable. However, the compression and simplification of an obviously complex issue seems just as problematic; in books such as this one, intended for a wider public, a clear exposition of the main points of contention is just as

<sup>9</sup> cf. the valid criticisms on this point by Ю.Н. Кузьмин, ВДИ 78.2 (2018), 417-18.

<sup>10</sup> J. Roisman & I. Worthington (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Malden–Oxford, 2010; R. J. Lane Fox (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon: Studies in the Archaeology and History of Macedon, 650 BC – 300 AD*. Leiden–Boston, 2011.

<sup>11</sup> see e.g. E. N. Borza, *In the shadow of Olympus: the emergence of Macedon*, Princeton, 1990, 110; B. Саракински, *Persomacedonica. Македонија и Персија пред Александар*, Скопје, 2013, 274-279.

<sup>12</sup> e.g. J. B. Bury & R. Meiggs, *A History of Greece*<sup>4</sup>, 184. contra Borza, o.c., 110, who separates the Alexander episode from the rest of the narrative.

valuable for the reader, arguably even more so, than the conclusion itself, especially when the matter can not be considered closed.

Even more peculiar is the mention of the Macedonian phalanx at Zama (125). The problem is twofold. Firstly, they are mentioned in the chapter concerned with the Macedonian army, but not when dealing with the diplomatic exchanges prior to the beginning of the war – the whole chain of events leading to the war in 200 is condensed to such extreme that it is practically non-existent. In fact one has to wonder what is the point of their mention at all in context of the composition of the Hellenistic armies. Secondly, the matter on the presence of the Macedonian troops at Zama is far from settled. Again, the issue is not that King accepts Livy's version, but rather the offered explanation for doing so – she sees no reason why Livy could not be correct (130 n.141). Not good enough. The question is of some importance when trying to unravel the mysterious diplomatic exchanges between Philip and Rome in the period between the two Macedonian wars and surely deserves a bit more elaborate argumentation. The main reason for doubting Livy is the fact that these Macedonian soldiers are not mentioned in Polybius nor in Appian, as well as the fact that even in Livy they play no role whatsoever in the ensuing battle. On the other hand, Livy mentions a Macedonian embassy to Rome, where Philip demands the return of the captives which is the strongest argument in favor of accepting their presence at Zama. As can be expected the scholarly opinion is divided – some prefer to completely discard Livy's version, some try to defend it, while some take a middle ground and think that there might have been some mercenaries though not sent officially by Philip.<sup>13</sup> Once again the matter is a bit more complex than simple belief. Considering the scope and aim of the book, had King limited herself to simply pointing the various opinions on the matter it would have been perfectly acceptable; however since she obviously takes a stance in the debate, the reader (or at least this one) expects a bit more elaborate argumentation.

Now, it might seem that at the root of these criticisms is a discrepancy between the goals of the author and the expectations of this reviewer, and up to a point that may be so. Yet one more example will show, I hope, that there is more to it. The troubled first decade of the reign of Amyntas III is a well known and vexing problem filled with chronological, narrative, and epigraphical uncertainties. In this case K.'s exposition (56-57) is fitting for the aims of the book, and though I do not agree with all of the conclusions, as stated before, that is beside the point. The reader can get a clear picture of the main issues – the date of the agreement with the Chalcidic league, the problem of the possible doublet in Diodor concerning the Illyrian invasion(s), and the hypothetical reign of Argaeus. Obviously, K. can be informative when she wishes so; yet this makes the instances such as the two discussed before all the more problematic. I am not trying to suggest that the visit before Plataea or the presence of Macedonian soldiers at Zama should receive the same lengthy treatment as the first decade of Amyntas' reign – one has to maintain a sense of proportion especially in a general work. Simply the same quality of attention and informativeness concerning the nature of the problem.

One such example is the question of the joint reign of Gonatas and Demetrius II. The problem is not the main text, but rather the accompanying note where the opinions of W. Adams and R. Errington are cited. However, Errington's thesis<sup>14</sup> against a joint kingship was largely based on the old reading of the inscription concerning a

<sup>13</sup> For the various opinions see the works cited in F. W. Walbank, *Historical commentary on Polybius II*, Oxford, 1967, 456; J. Briscoe, *Commentary on Livy, books 31-33*, Oxford, 1973, 55. cf. V. M. Warrior, *The Initiation of the Second Macedonian War*, Stuttgart, 1996, 103; A. M. Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, Malden – Oxford, 2008, 251 n.71.

<sup>14</sup> R. M. Errington, "An Inscription from Beroea and the Alleged Co-Rule of Demetrius II", *AM* 2 (1977), 115–122.

manumission of slaves from Beroea.<sup>15</sup> With the new and improved reading there can be no doubt that we are dealing with Demetrius II,<sup>16</sup> and therefore Errington's argumentation is now largely outdated. Whether this settles the question as most scholars believe is another matter, especially in light of the letter of Philoxenus.<sup>17</sup> These new developments were not included in the book, so the reader is presented with an already outdated version, which is quite unfortunate since one of the aims of the book is to give an up to date overview. On the other hand, it can not be reasonably expected an author to be equally informed and versed in every period and problem from the history of ancient Macedonia, so perhaps at least part of the responsibility lies with the reviewers.

Even if the previous example is at least up to a point pardonable, the next one is most certainly not. Nowhere does the unequal treatment, or lack of interest for certain topics, manifest itself more obviously than the glaring statement that we know little about the composition and structure of the Macedonian army in the Hellenistic period (125). The scholars working on this particular subject would be quite surprised by this statement. Certainly, we don't know as much as we would like to, but that is not the same as to say that we know very little. If nothing else, the two monographs on the subject by M. Hatzopoulos and V. Sekunda<sup>18</sup> would have sufficed for K. to give even a tentative summary, but neither of the books are to be found in the bibliography. King's approach is all the more startling since she devotes three pages on the army before Philip II (107-110), even though we know even less about its composition and structure.

2. Which brings me to the second issue – the division and thematic coverage in the book. As mentioned before, the division and the subject of the chapters is conventional, and that is precisely what is debatable. R. Errington decided not to include Alexander's eastern campaign in his book, except naturally where it affected the Macedonian state,<sup>19</sup> and in part a similar approach was taken by N. Hammond and F. Walbank;<sup>20</sup> approach that for various reasons seems sensible and acceptable. Unfortunately, K. decided to go the more traditional way and devotes two chapters, that is, almost 50 pages (131-177) to the reign of Alexander, not counting the ten pages from the chapter on Macedonian military that naturally are devoted on Alexander's army (114-125). Admittedly, this is more of a subjective remark than a proper criticism. Still, I maintain that the book would have benefited greatly if those forty-odd pages dedicated on Alexander were instead used for a more elaborate elucidation on various other problems from the history of ancient Macedonia. In fact the period of almost sixty years from the start of Alexander's reign till the accession of Antigonus Gonatas on the Macedonian throne takes up a disproportionately large part of the book of roughly 100 pages (131-234). I'm not trying to say that the period is unimportant for most certainly it is, simply whether, in a book that covers the whole history of the ancient Macedonian kingdom on roughly 270 pages, it was necessary to cover those sixty years in such a detail as to take up more than a third of the whole book. This is all the more debatable since K. does not devote much space on the various "constitutional" problems and dilemmas, nor on the nature of the new kingdoms and the way they functioned. It is more or less a standard political and military narrative of the

<sup>15</sup> M. Andronikos, *Ἀρχαῖαι ἐπιγραφαὶ Βεροίας*, Thessaloniki, 1950, no.1.

<sup>16</sup> EKM i.45.

<sup>17</sup> A. Tzafalias & B. Helly, "Inscriptions de la Tripolis de Perrhébie. Lettres royales de Démétrios II et Antigone Dôsôn", *Studi Ellenistici* 24 (2010), no.1; *BE* 2011, no.399. cf. *StV* III, no. 498.

<sup>18</sup> M. B. Hatzopoulos, *L'organisation de l'armée macédonienne sous les Antigonides. Problèmes anciens et documents nouveaux* (Мελετήματα 30), Athènes, 2001; N. V. Sekunda, *The Antigonid Army*, Gdańsk, 2013.

<sup>19</sup> R. M. Errington, *A History of Macedonia*, Berkeley – Los Angeles, 1990, vii.

<sup>20</sup> N. G. L. Hammond & F. W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia*, Oxford, 1988.

period, and even the acquiring of the title basileus by the Diadochi is mentioned just in passing without much of a discussion on its importance.<sup>21</sup>

Now some might say fuller the sources more elaborate the narrative. Fair enough. But if that is so, then why are the reigns of Philip V and Perseus, about whom we know far more than the other Macedonian kings save for Philip II and Alexander III, compressed to the outmost extreme? Unsatisfactory as the sources can be at times, primarily thanks to Polybius and Livy we are relatively well informed about these two rulers especially in comparison with some other kings; additionally their combined reigns spanned for half a century (221-168). Yet the period is covered in meager fifteen pages (246-261), and needless to say compressed beyond the acceptable level. Obviously it is not a question of the available sources – K. is simply more interested in some periods than others. In fact the whole period of the Antigonids (ch.10) is so compressed, at times simplified and plagued with errors (some of which will be mentioned shortly) that it is quite an unreliable guide for the novice reader. In fact, K. would have made herself a service if she left out the Antigonids from the book completely, for it is clear that her interests lay elsewhere.

3. Lastly, there are numerous errors and somewhat curious statements in the book, some more surprising than others. Few examples will suffice. The capture of Eion and the subsequent Athenian policy in the region could hardly result in a monopoly on the timber as K. implies (31). Considering the vast resources of the Olympus-Pierian massif and of Mt. Vermion,<sup>22</sup> nothing short of a complete subjugation of Macedon could result in an Athenian monopoly. Athens did not loose the Peloponnesian war because Sparta managed to cut off the grain supply by controlling the Chersonese (79-80). That is not to say that the Chersonese was not of vital interest for Athens, however it was the loss of the Athenian fleet at Aegospotami that enabled the Spartans to impose a blockade on the city regardless of the situation on the Chersonese. The Getae were most certainly not a Celtic tribe as K. makes them, nor was Alexander the Great fighting Celts on the Danube (139). The error is all the more dumbfounding, since K. previously identifies the Getae as a Thracian tribe (89). Demetrius of Phaleron did not flee directly to Egypt (222), but lived in Thebes and left Greece after the death of Casander.<sup>23</sup> It was not Ptolemy II who fought the III Syrian War, but his successor Ptolemy III. Nor did the defeat at the battle of Andros result in a Ptolemaic retreat from the Aegean (240). Quite the contrary at roughly the same time the Ptolemies managed to gain a foothold on the thracian coast.<sup>24</sup> Now this may look like a misprint, but it is not, for just before the battle of Andros and the III Syrian War, K. mentions Ptolemy II in context of his possible involvement in the revolt of Alexander, and then simply proceeds to the other two previously mentioned events. The Aetolians and Philip were not allies as a result of the peace of 206 (251). The decisive battle between the Romans and Antiochus III was not at Magnesia on Maeander (255), but at Magnesia under Sypilos. Perseus was not allied with the Thessalians, Aetolians or Rhodes (257). Nor were the Achaeans considering a new alliance with him (257). The debate was whether to accept Perseus' offer for reestablishment and normalization of diplomatic relations.

<sup>21</sup> I do not understand K.'s hesitation whether Casander used the title basileus in Macedonia, since both the numismatic and epigraphic evidence is clear on the problem. For it is attested not only on the one inscription from Cassandreia (*Syll.<sup>3</sup>* 332) that K. refers to, but also another from Cassandreia (*SEG* 47.940) and from Dion (*SEG* 34.620); as well as on bronze coins (e.g. O. Mørkholm, *Early Hellenistic Coinage*, Cambridge, 1991, 60, 79).

<sup>22</sup> E. N. Borza, "Timber and Politics in the Ancient World: Macedon and the Greeks", *PAPS* 131 (1987), 36, 39.

<sup>23</sup> Plut., *Dem.*, 9.3; Diog. Laert., 5.78.

<sup>24</sup> cf. G. Hölbl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, London – New York, 2001, 48-51.

Not everything in the book is problematic as the examples discussed on the previous pages. Some parts are satisfactory, and the large number of figures is especially commendable since they can be quite informative and helpful for the general public. Yet as a whole, the uneven treatment of various subject and problems, and especially the period of the Antigonids, as well as the number of errors, unfortunately greatly diminish the value of the book as an introductory guide for the history of ancient Macedonia.

Stefan Panovski  
Institute of National History  
Skopje, Macedonia

MICHał BZINKOWSKI, *Masks of Charos in Modern Greek demotic songs, sources, representation and context*. Kraków. Jagiellonian University Press 2017. Pp. 171. ISBN 978-83-233-4330-1.

Michał Bzinkowski is an Associate Professor at the Department of Classics at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, where he teaches Modern Greek Language, Modern Greek Literature, as well as Ancient Greek Epic and Lyric Poetry. He also translates modern Greek poetry into Polish. His close interest for the lingering heritage in the European and especially the Modern Greek culture, as well as years of sturdy work, resulted in his latest scholarly research.

As the author himself writes, the ancient ferryman of the dead, whose name was inherited by Charos (Χάρος), the modern personification of Death, was rather neglected in the pantheon of Greek gods and appears very rarely in Ancient Greek literature. But, in the European consciousness, Charon is mostly associated with his representation in Dante's *Inferno*, where he appears as an old man with fiery eyes and demonic in appearance, which was, as we know, merely borrowed from Virgil's *Aeneid*. On the other hand, in spite of the fact that the figure of Charos is well known in the Hellenic world, the way he is represented has an added degree of complexity, intertwined with many common stereotypes. The representation of Charos as a successor of the ancient Charon, especially in the Modern Greek demotic songs, is the subject of prof. Bzinkowski's book.

The book itself is divided in seven chapters. The content of each is as follows:

I. Preface. – In the first part the author lays down the main difference between the characters of Charon and Charos, as well as the understandable mix-up of the two. Also, in this part the author himself presents us the content of the book.

II. Chapter I - Sources. – The first chapter of the main body of the book is itself divided into two parts. The first of the two being called *Folk songs in the nineteenth and twentieth century Greece*, deals with the source of the demotic songs in which the character of Charos appears. It also shines the light on the research of the accomplished researchers of this type of songs, some of which do not have a Greek heritage. The second part deals with the mirologia songs (dirges) as well as the folk songs depicting the Underworld and Charos.

III. Chapter II - Representation. – This chapter focuses on the representation of Charos. The chapter itself is divided in four parts. The first part deals with the Underworld and its representation in the demotic songs. Here the author compares the depictions of the Underworld in several different cultures, such as the Acadian, the Babylonian, the ancient Greek, and depictions in the Old Testament with the one gi-