

## Book Review

Patrice Brun – Laurence Cavalier – Koray Konuk – Francis Prost (edd.), *Euploia: la Lycie et la Carie antiques. Dynamiques des territoires, échanges et identités*. Actes du colloque de Bordeaux, 5, 6 et 7 novembre 2009. Mémoires 34. Bordeaux: Éditions Ausonius, 2013, Pp. 472, ISBN 9782356130914; € 55.00.

This volume is one of the most recent to appear in a growing number of conference proceedings on Caria and Lycia.<sup>1</sup> As the editors of one of these volumes, we thoroughly sympathise with the difficulty of gathering papers in widely different fields of expertise into a coherent whole. Even when dealing, as here, with a very specific corner of Asia Minor, the danger is the fragmentation of specialised treatments of evidence, for instance into archaeological, historical and philological clusters which do not interact with one another. It is perhaps surprising that no effort has been made to situate the volume within the recent effervescence of Carian and Lycian studies. Instead, in his introduction, P. Brun sets out the ‘mission statement’ of the Bordeaux-based Euploia project (now concluded) whose main aim has been to contextualise the regions of Caria and Lycia within the larger ‘Mediterranean networks’ debate.<sup>2</sup> The project’s emphasis on the coastal regions’ permeability to outside influences is admirable, but few of the papers directly address the topic of interaction or contribute substantively to the wider context of ‘échanges’. Notable exceptions include a brief article on the Austrian survey at the Lycian port of Andriake by the regretted Th. Marksteiner, to whom the Euploia volume is dedicated; and two reports on the French and Canadian prize project at the Lycian site of Xanthos. The latter are only preludes to more extensive publications, but already fundamentally change our perception of the relation between Xanthos and its main sanctuary, the Letôon, and the importance of both sites within the wider context of the eastern Mediterranean. L. Cavalier and J. des Courtils, through stylistic comparisons between the temple of Leto, the Ptolemaion at Limyra and its namesake at Samothrace, show irrefutably (note the tellingly juxtaposed images of the three structures on pp. 147–151) that we must accept an early third-century, Ptolemaic, context for the complex of temples at the Letôon rather than the second-century BC date which has until now prevailed. É. Écochard and collaborators present the results of a multidisciplinary geomorphological study of the Xanthos delta (modern Eşen Çayı), offering a reconstruction of the physical context of the Letôon from the Holocene onward, which forces us to rethink the character of

---

<sup>1</sup> Caria: F. Rumscheid (ed.), *Die Karer und die Anderen*. Internationales Kolloquium an der Freien Universität Berlin 13. bis 15. Oktober 2005, Bonn 2009; R. van Bremen – J.-M. Carbon (edd.), *Hellenistic Karia: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Hellenistic Karia*. Oxford, 29 June–2 July 2006, Bordeaux 2010; L. Karlsson – S. Carlsson (edd.), *Labraunda and Karia*. Proceedings of the International Symposium Commemorating Sixty Years of Swedish Archaeological Work in Labraunda, Stockholm, November 20–21, 2008, *Boreas* 32, Uppsala 2011; O. Henry (ed.) *4th Century Karia, Defining a Karian Identity under the Hekatomnids*, *Varia Anatolica* 28, Paris 2013.

Lycia: the series of proceedings of the international Lykien-Symposium published as *Ergänzungsbände zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris*, of which Schuler 2007 is the latest (below, n. 6; and see p. 18 there for references to earlier volumes).

<sup>2</sup> But Brun’s contention (p. 12) that “la recherche française pouvait nourrir un débat largement dominé aujourd’hui par une réflexion anglo-saxonne”, strikes one as oddly parochial, not only because well over half of the authors in this volume are not French (and few are Anglo-Saxon) but especially because real progress so obviously lies in wider cooperation and cross-fertilisation.

the sanctuary in the historical period and the reason for its location: surrounded by lagoons and marshes, the site, on a rocky elevation, was accessible only by boat.

The first and last parts of the subtitle are perhaps where the volume's strengths lie. Throughout, there is a focus on 'dynamiques des territoires' and 'identités', brought out more sharply by the decision to contrast the two regions. The notion of ethnic identity also runs like a thread through the very long (52 pp.) 'Concluding Remarks' of M. Waelkens, whose task appears to have been to provide detailed summaries of all the papers in the volume, sometimes usefully illuminating connections, or showing up contradictions, but too often repeating himself in the effort to render scrupulously what has already been said.

The volume begins with a pair of papers by leading scholars in the study of the Carian and Lycian languages respectively. I. Adiego offers a masterful synopsis of the many different Carian alphabets attested in inscriptions from the fifth and fourth centuries BC, outlining how there was a shared linguistic identity in all of this diversity. The paper also reaffirms some of Adiego's important hypotheses concerning ethnics, for instance *alosδ kârnosδ* = 'from Halikarnassos', though there are still problems with others (*mdaýn-/mwdon-* = 'from Mylasa'?). What is striking is how fast the field evolves: several new Carian inscriptions have already appeared since the time of the conference.<sup>3</sup> We must hope for a supplement to, or a revised version of, Adiego's major work on the Carian language.<sup>4</sup> For his part, D. Schürr gives a very useful (though in parts rather cryptic) survey of the Lycian language and script, whose secondary aim is to outline salient ethnic and regional features. Among these, he points out the strong presence of local dynasts in the epigraphic and numismatic record, and the multiplicity of Lycian heroes and *pantes theoi*, including mysterious cases like Trosobios and Teseti. The paper concludes with an enjoyable excursus on verse inscriptions in Lycian and a scene of reading depicted on a relief from Tyberissos, but one is left wondering what is the upshot of all these discrete vignettes.

Schürr's paper has many merits, not least of which is an effort at building a bridge (p. 30) with another paper in the volume, that of P. Baker and G. Thériault (though the invitation is not taken up by the latter authors). One of the Lycian dynasts in the 480s BC was a certain Kybernis son of Kossikas (Lyc. Kheziga; cf. Hdt. 7.98). Discovered in 2007 at Xanthos is a wall-block inscribed in the third century BC with a dedication by Ptolemaic soldiers. The recipient is one Kybernis, thus presumably the heroised dynast. The identification raises interesting questions, most of which Baker and Thériault ably and prudently discuss. Noteworthy is the preference for a local hero in the worshipping practices of (foreign?) soldiers, but the continuity of the cult over two centuries remains an enigma.

A few further papers dealing with religion bring us into murkier 'territory'. F. Colas-Rannou approaches the question of Lycian identity by looking at the iconography of Lycian funerary pillars of the sixth and fifth centuries BC, and the possibility of Greek stylistic influences or similarities. One point of focus are the bird-women snatching away a naked man or child, depicted on the so-called 'Harpy Pillar' from Xanthos. The author rightly asserts that the Lycian figures are earlier and markedly different from the Greek ones, and more generally, that the Lycian iconographic programme is a hybrid one, containing a juxtaposition of various elements. But is she then justified in jumping to conclusions about the symbolism of the 'Harpy' figures, stating (p. 54) that: "rien n'est plus Lycien que le fait de représenter des "génies" funéraires sous la forme de femmes-oiseaux "courotrophes", dans un style grec, sur un pilier funéraire"? P. Debord's wide-ranging survey of the goddess Hekate attempts to divine her Carian origins from meagre evidence. The author passes all too briefly over some very complex issues. He glosses

<sup>3</sup> A. Herda – E. Sauter, *Karerinnen und Karer in Milet: Zu einem spätklassischen Schlüsselchen mit karischem Graffito aus Milet*, AA 2009/2 51–112; and an inscription from Hydai (Damlıboğaz) near Mylasa: S. Türkteki – R. Tekoğlu, *Une inscription carienne sur oenochoé au Musée de Sadberk Hanım*, Kadmos 51, 2012, 99–113.

<sup>4</sup> I.-J. Adiego, *The Carian Language*, Leiden and Boston 2007.

over how early and how widely the cult was adopted in the Greek world (e.g. p. 89, for the “théonyme [sic] Hekataios” as “banal dès les VIe -Ve s.”), and most significantly the fact that the name Hekate is a frequent by-name or epithet for Artemis. Even so, he makes the assumption that  $\chi\tau$  must be a Carian phoneme (p. 90). As far as theophoric names are concerned, a study by R. Parker (not cited by Debord) has pointed towards “regional onomastic fashion”.<sup>5</sup> A predilection for the cult in Caria may or may not say anything meaningful about its origins.

More grounded is the conspectus of sanctuaries in the Carian Chersonese (Rhodian Peraia) undertaken by W. Held. The paper is a useful attempt to trace the evolutions of ‘Carian’ or local sanctuaries into more monumental ones under Rhodes in the third century BC. It also presents a model of *koina* as typically ‘Carian’ institutions, and assumes without further discussion that the *koinon* of the Chersonesians had a history well before the Hellenistic period, when it is specifically attested. This view, although entirely speculative, is given the status of fact in Waelkens’ ‘Concluding Remarks’ (pp. 409–410). It needs qualifying though: many *koina* in this region seem to have acquired the title only as a result of Rhodian domination.

Several of the articles (Pimouguet-Pedarros, Pedersen, Karlsson and Brüns-Özgan) are concerned with building techniques as identifiers not only of a Carian or Lycian, but of a uniform ‘Hekatomnid’ style, especially in military architecture. The theme of ‘échanges’ and cross-Mediterranean influences (Sicily, Carthage, Peloponnese, Attica) on architectural style and technique is well observed by the authors, even if not all agree on the direction or the date of such influences, something which Waelkens usefully picks up in his long summary (pp. 391–407). The walls of Knidos offer a case in point. Chr. Bruns-Özgan (under ‘Identités’) and I. Pimouguet-Pédarros (under ‘Architecture et pouvoir’) are both concerned with architecture as an expression of ‘identity’, and in part cover the same ground. Pimouguet-Pédarros, as part of a wider discussion of Carian/Hekatomnid styles in monumental architecture, discusses the city walls of Knidos and concludes that they are largely post-Hekatomnid (p. 166), whereas Bruns-Özgan argues that they are primarily of the mid-fourth century, and so Hekatomnid. There is no direct engagement between the two papers, and it is impossible to tell whether the photo which each author shows of a fourth-century part of Knidos’ city walls is of the same section. Bruns-Özgan’s main concern is to demonstrate that there was a Hekatomnid impetus behind a consolidated Knidian ‘building programme’. She also suggests (p. 44) a location for a fourth century BC(?) cult site of Apollo Karneios in the city, on the terrace between the two harbours. (Here, as elsewhere in this article, the reader longs for a site-plan.) Some of her certainties (e.g. Pytheos ‘and his engineers’ being in overall charge of the building program, p. 50) are presented without proof or supporting evidence (see also Waelkens’ reservations on pp. 394–396). Pimouguet-Pédarros’ conclusions on the overwhelmingly Hekatomnid nature of Carian military architecture is complemented by Karlsson’s detailed discussion, based on recent excavations, of the forts at and around Labraunda, three of which he is able to date conclusively through analysis of pottery finds to the Hekatomnid period.

Equally concerned with issues of dating and identity is P. Pedersen, whose article on architectural relations between Lycia and Caria forms a pair with that of F. Prost. Pedersen’s is a detailed investigation of the stylistic and technical aspects of the Mausoleum at Halikarnassos and the Nereid monument at Xanthos. The latter’s clamps (Attic) and dowels (Lycian) exemplify that monument’s cultural hybridity, as do the monumental superstructure and its iconography, with which Prost is mainly concerned. Based on a rigorous assessment of both structures, Pedersen’s surprising – and counter-intuitive? – conclusion is that the Nereid tomb borrowed stylistically and technically from Hekatomnid architectural develop-

---

<sup>5</sup> R.C.T. Parker, *Theophoric Names and the History of Greek Religion*, in S. Hornblower – E. Matthews (edd.) *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence*, Oxford 2000, 53–80; here especially 69–70.

ments at the Mausoleum and the temple of Zeus at Labraunda. This requires him to downdate the Lycian monument to around 370 or even somewhat later and to postulate a date in the early 370s for the Hekatomnid structures, well before the death of Maussollos in the late 350s. Traditionally assigned to c. 380 or even earlier, the Nereid tomb would thus be disconnected from its ‘Grabherr’, the Lycian dynast Arbinas. Prost avoids falling into the ‘who borrowed what from whom’ trap and instead emphasises the idiosyncratically ‘Lycian’ and ‘Carian’ character of these structures. Each was the culmination of a quite separate cultural and architectural tradition of aristocratic tomb building, whose adoption and adaptation of Greek elements was only one aspect of a complex visual programme. Underpinning these two studies is the paper by O. Henry, on the ‘petrification’ of Carian tombs constructed mainly in wood during the Archaic period, but whose wooden elements were perpetuated in their stone-built successors, even when they had lost their original function. A. Carsten’s investigation of a series of elite tombs from the Halikarnassos peninsula also contributes to the subject. Her too brief discussion introduces the intriguing theme of sacrifice and feasting at the grave site (p. 108), although this is not conspicuous in the evidence from the peninsula. Her efforts to see these presumed rituals as part of wider, ‘competitive’ elite-networks across the Mediterranean are stimulating but highly speculative.

Another group of papers continues the study of territory, and once more turns to problems of identity. Th. Corsten studies four cities in the Kibyrtis (northern Lycia), and plausibly argues, partly on onomastic grounds, that all were founded by Pisidians, very likely from Termessos. He discusses the extent to which they (Kibyra, Balbura, Oinoanda and Bubon) were modelled on Greek *poleis* and in particular the chronology of their institutional and monumental Hellenisation which may well have been part and parcel of the foundation process, rather than the result of Attalid influence as others have suggested. F. Kolb, focussing on a small number of central Lycian cities, attributes their late Hellenisation to political causes. The absence of public buildings associated with the Greek civic model of the Hellenistic period is a direct result of the absence (or late development) of the dynamics of civic life and public funding, and of the residual effects of the dynastic model. D. Rousset makes two important points about the *Stadiasmus Patarensis*: first, the road network set out on the now famous pillar was neither a creation *ex nihilo* by the Romans, nor was it necessarily the expression of ideological Romanisation (otherwise the distances would have been given in miles rather than in stades); second, against Chr. Schuler, the points of reference on the road system were not all by definition *poleis*.<sup>6</sup> M. Nafissi and R. Fabiani are both concerned with reconstructing the policies and attitudes of the Iasian citizen body in the fourth century. Fabiani, working mainly from civic decrees and prosopography, suggests that there were deep divisions among the Iasian elite families, whose loyalties lay either with the Hekatomnid satraps or with Athens (the “philo-Athenian set”). From this perspective, she reconstructs the family- and political background of the Iasians Gorgos and Minnion, best known through the role they played in persuading Alexander the Great to give the so-called ‘Little Sea’ back to their home city. She argues that Gorgos was not an anti-Hekatomnid exile, driven from the city after a failed ‘conspiracy’ against Maussollos, but rather pro-Hekatomnid and anti-Athenian, supporter of Samians exiled from their island by the Athenians. Nafissi also has to navigate these choppy political waters in an effort to understand a tantalisingly incomplete epigram in honour of the satrap Idrieus, inscribed on a Hekatomnid family monument set up by the Iasians. Two blocks of this monument are now known: one, carrying the epigram, was recently found at Iasos itself; another has long been in the Istanbul archaeological museum, but until recently was not recognised as coming from Iasos. It carries a simple inscription: ‘Aba Hyssaldomou’. The epigram has proved both fascinating and difficult to restore: most problematic is the deliberate erasure of a

---

<sup>6</sup> Chr. Schuler, Ein Vertrag zwischen Rom und den Lykiern aus Tyberissos, in idem (ed.) *Griechische Epigraphik in Lykien. Eine Zwischenbilanz*, Vienna 2007, 51–79.

word, or words, following the name of Idrieus in the third line. The text presented here is no longer that to which Nafissi adheres: a new and better version will be published in *Studi Classici e Orientali*, vol. 60 (2014). One of the gains of the reconstruction has been the convincing suggestion that Aba is most likely represented on the monument as Idrieus' mother, which makes her not only sister but also wife to Hekatomnos, and thus adds another generation of Hekatomnid brother-sister marriage to those already known.

Near the end of the volume, three recent and ongoing surveys are presented under the rubric “Nouvelles découvertes archéologiques” (cf. also the paper by A. Tirpan et al. on tombs from the site of Börükçü between Stratonikeia and Lagina, which should have been grouped in this section). T. Korkut gives an overview of work in Tlos, which notably includes a temple of Kronos and several tombs. K. İren offers a detailed introduction to the site of Idyma on the Ceramic gulf, with helpful references to previous reports and an extensive list of nearby settlements and forts; briefly mentioned are an acropolis, a settlement site, a necropolis, and an “open-air rock sanctuary of Cybele” (p. 351). Finally, A. Kızıl presents a detailed report on three Hellenistic tombs at Belentepe in the area of Keramos, one of which remarkably includes a round stone table for offerings that has a leg shaped in the form of a goat (p. 363–364 with fig. 9).

At just over two kilograms, with glossy paper, a small font and a very wide page layout, the book does not make for comfortable reading. It is lavishly illustrated, but many of the photographs are tiny, sometimes unnecessarily so. Some of the maps are impossible to read because of the microscopic size of the print and/or smudging (pp. 94–95, 98, 114, 117, 125, 213, 360). There is a consolidated bibliography, and brief indices of names, places, and varia, as well as an (incomplete) index of sources. There are some slips and sloppinesses in the editing, perhaps unavoidable in such a large and multilingual volume, although the omission of entire individual bibliographies from the final consolidated bibliography is an obstacle when following up footnotes (the articles so affected are: Prost, Écochard et al., Marksteiner, Baker & Thériault).

The volume succeeds in gathering an abundant variety of original and informative papers. We learn much about the fast-moving fields of Carian and Lycian studies, though the gaps in our knowledge and the wide scope for conjecture remain obvious.

Riet van Bremen

Jan-Mathieu Carbon