

simultaneously he invites students and wider circles of readers to take a chance on the fascinating subject of ancient Macedonia. Sabine MÜLLER

Waldemar HECKEL, Johannes HEINRICHS, Sabine MÜLLER & Frances POWNALL (Eds.), *Lexicon of Argead Makedonia*. Berlin, Frank & Timme, 2020. 1 vol. relié, 538 p. Prix : 128 €. ISBN 978-3-732-90-4051.

Fruit of the joint initiative of four prominent historians of ancient Macedonia, the *Lexicon* is devoted to the history of the Macedonian kingdom under its first dynasty, the Argeads or, as these rulers most probably called themselves, the Temenids. The 280 entries of the volume are signed by a cohort of specialists that counts, aside from the four editors, 40 other scholars from various European, North American and Australian institutions. Entries have the form of short essays, whose length never exceeds five pages (in 33 cases, the reader is directly referenced to other entries), and they fall under the following thematic categories: ancient written and material sources, historical individuals and peoples, specific historical events, geographic terms, political, military, economic, religious and other cultural practices and institutions. Two entries are dedicated to the fascinating subjects of the reception of Alexander III in medieval literature and western art, respectively. Well-conceived and very broad, the scope of the volume warrants some comments with regard to two particular aspects. The first concerns the predominance of topics that are related to the political and military history of the kingdom, bringing to the fore high-rank individuals and groups, mostly kings and generals. Entries on other facets of history have a much more discrete presence and they, too, remain focused on the upper echelons of the Macedonian society (e.g. *Hunt; Marriage; Sexuality; Women, Argead royal*). The second aspect pertains to the chronological coverage of the volume. According to the editors (p. 8), this begins with the foundation of the kingdom, around the mid-7th c. BC, and ends with the death of Alexander IV in c. 310 BC. Nevertheless, information provided on the period prior to the late 6th c. BC and the beginning of the Persian dominion in the northern Aegean is meager. Far from attesting any sort of negligence on behalf of the editors, both the aforementioned phenomena are deeply rooted in a long-standing historiographical tradition that still prevails not only in studies of ancient Macedonia but more broadly in the field of Classics. Prioritizing ancient texts over other historical sources, studies produced within this tradition mirror the scope of the texts on which they rely. Thus, in the case of Temenid Macedonia, topics such as the history of the non-elite population or the period before the late 6th c. BC, which are little documented by literary sources, are automatically considered as inaccessible for research. In the same vein, all rulers of Lower Macedonia before Amyntas I – and not just the ones who appear in the foundation myths – are readily (but questionably) placed in the mythical sphere (p. 80, 100, 245). In the context of the same scholarly tradition, archaeological finds, with the exceptions of inscriptions and coins, are rarely seen as anything more than props that can enliven written narratives. Accordingly, while the authors of the *Lexicon* make abundant use of epigraphic and numismatic sources, references to other forms of material culture are marginal and essentially limited to aspects of monumental art from the late Classical period. The only graves mentioned in the entry on *Burial*, for instance,

are the royal graves that were unearthed under the Great Tumulus at Aigai. Undoubtedly, some of the reasons behind the perpetuation of this historiographical tradition (particularly problems of accessibility to archaeological information) lie beyond the will of historians. Furthermore, the interpretation of material remains involves no fewer difficulties than that of ancient texts. Yet, theoretically informed contextual analyses of archaeological evidence form a powerful historiographical tool, which we cannot afford to leave unexploited. Such analyses may enhance considerably our knowledge of ancient Macedonia on the one hand, by elucidating textually undocumented periods, practices and social groups, and on the other, by providing a more nuanced understanding of written sources. Perhaps one may wish for a future edition of the *Lexicon* to integrate more archaeologically derived information. Still, one cannot fail to commend the present edition for its holistic approach of the extant literary, epigraphic and numismatic sources. The breadth of the addressed topics, which go into details such as *Beards*, *beardlessness* and *War traumata*, is very likely to surpass most readers' expectations. In this sense, the presence of a complete list of the entries or that of an index would have facilitated searches. A significant advantage that comes with the lexicon-format is the possibility to present the relations of Macedonia with other regions, such as *Athens* or *Boiotia*, in continuous narratives that adopt a long-term perspective. Inevitably, there is some repetition and overlap (e.g. among *Chalkidians*; *Nikias*; *Peloponnesian war*; *Perdikkas II*; *Thucydides*). Still, the wealth of information gained through the combined reading of interrelated essays is often much greater than that found in history handbooks. Compared to such handbooks, the *Lexicon* further places a more pronounced emphasis on the critique of literary sources, offering a thorough overview of the surviving texts and, at the same time, of the intellectual background of the respective ancient authors. An additional merit of the *Lexicon* stems from the editors' wish for the contents to reflect the current state of research, without eschewing scientific impasses, debates and disagreements (p. 8-9). Although this aim is generally fulfilled, there is one exception. This pertains to the politically thorny and, in my own view, not particularly important question of the ethnic identity of ancient Macedonians. Despite the fact that this question is not tackled directly anywhere in the volume, several entries affirm a) that the Greeks did not view the Macedonians as of their own stock (e.g. *Argeads*, *terminology*; *Barbaroi*) and b) that the first Macedonian claim to a Hellenic origin was put forward by Alexander I, who is accredited with the creation of the earliest Temenid genealogical myth, which placed Perdikkas at the head of the dynasty (e.g. *Alexander I*; *Foundation myth*). The ethnic identity of the Macedonians is certainly a very complex matter, which is usually addressed on the basis of essentialist concepts of ethnicity and diverging interpretations of the same (largely biased) written sources. Regardless of the approach one may opt for with regard to this matter, readers of the *Lexicon* should have been informed that none of the two aforementioned "affirmations" is unanimously accepted. Both are challenged, for instance, by G. Mallios, whose doctoral dissertation offers the most thorough study of the genealogical myths of the Macedonians and their rulers (*Μύθος και Ιστορία. Η περίπτωση της αρχαίας Μακεδονίας*, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2011; <<https://www.didaktorika.gr/eadd/handle/10442/26955>>). Moreover, in a recent article M. Tiverios has argued that the version presenting Perdikkas as the first king was most likely introduced by Perdikkas II and was preceded by a much older version, according

to which the founder of the dynasty was Caranus (“Κάρανος, ο γενάρχης της Μακεδονικής βασιλικής δυναστείας. Η νομισματική μαρτυρία”, *Archaiologike Ephemeris* 158 [2019] p. 195-212). The understandable choice to refrain from considering in detail the problem of ancient Macedonian identity may also explain the rather cursory treatment of Macedonian language. For this topic the reader is redirected to the entries *Calendar, Makedonian; Inscriptions; and Names, Makedonian and Argead*. Although language should by no means be considered as an “objective criterion” for the definition of ethnic identities, this aspect of Macedonian culture deserved a lengthier discussion in its own right. A reference to M. Hatzopoulos’ latest overview of research on the subject might have also been helpful (“Recent Research in the Ancient Macedonia Dialect: Consolidation and New Perspectives”, in G.K. Giannakis *et al.* [eds.], *Studies in Ancient Greek Dialects*, Berlin, 2017, p. 299-328). These remarks notwithstanding, there is no doubt that the *Lexicon* will be invaluable to anyone interested in Temenid Macedonia. Thanks to its authoritative and lucid essays, students and scholars alike will be able to broaden and deepen their knowledge over a wide range of topics, not all of which have found their way into traditional handbooks.

VIVI SARIPANIDI

Vincent AZOULAY et Paulin ISMARD, *Athènes 403, une histoire chorale*. Paris, Flammarion, 2020. 1 vol. broché, 15 x 24 cm, 454 p. (AU FIL DE L’HISTOIRE). Prix : 25 €. ISBN 978-2-0813-3472-4.

Cet ouvrage, écrit par deux historiens de la Grèce antique, porte sur une période troublée de l’histoire d’Athènes, au terme de la guerre du Péloponnèse et de la défaite calamiteuse d’Athènes face à Sparte. Ce ne fut pas la seule conséquence de ce long affrontement – il dura 27 ans (431-404) – entre les deux puissantes cités : par deux fois, la démocratie athénienne cessa d’exister, en 411 par l’instauration d’un Conseil des Quatre-Cents, aboli en 410 à la faveur du retour à un régime démocratique, et surtout, après la capitulation d’Athènes en 404, par l’arrivée au pouvoir de trente hommes, appelés « les Trente ». Le régime qu’ils mirent en place fut bref – un an et demi au maximum – et prit fin grâce à la victoire des démocrates athéniens sur les Trente, mais il fut caractérisé par une violence telle que la terreur domina et resta liée à leur souvenir dans la littérature et l’imaginaire grecs. La période 404/403 est abordée, après une substantielle introduction (p. 9-38), en dix chapitres (p. 39-304), dont la conclusion permet d’en entrevoir quelques lignes de force (p. 305-338). Des repères chronologiques bienvenus (p. 341-341), des notes très abondantes (p. 343-436), l’index des noms (p. 437-444), la table des figures (p. 445-446), les remerciements (p. 447-448) et la table des matières (p. 449-451) terminent le livre. Le sous-titre *Une histoire chorale* indique le fil directeur de l’ouvrage. Constatant que le chœur, dans la comédie et la tragédie attiques, est une référence permanente qui permet de penser la cité comme un ensemble de chœurs, V. Azoulay et P. Ismard étudient les répercussions des terribles années 404 et 403 sur plusieurs protagonistes et sur leur entourage (leurs chœurs). Cette perspective leur évite de rédiger une histoire des “grands hommes” : si certaines figures sont historiques (Critias, l’un des Trente et oncle de Platon, le stratège Thrasybule ayant chassé les Trente et rétabli la démocratie, Archinos, le démocrate « modéré », Socrate