

moins de redondances. Enfin, on ne peut que regretter que l'auteur n'ait pas mis à jour ses études de cas. En dix ans, les travaux sur les sites de restauration ont beaucoup avancé ou se sont achevés. Quant aux monuments dont la restauration était déjà terminée au moment de la rédaction de la thèse, il aurait été pertinent d'aller observer leur apparence plus récente et la façon dont les restaurations étaient aujourd'hui accueillies et présentées au public. La qualité médiocre des illustrations est également dommage.

Ausonius UMR 5607 CNRS, Université Bordeaux Montaigne

Audrey Dubernet

J. Valeva, E. Nankov and D. Graninger (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Thrace*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, Wiley Blackwell, Malden, MA/Oxford/Chichester 2015, xx+487 pp., illustrations. Cased. ISBN 978-1-4443-5104-0

In this addition to the *Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World* the editors declare their intention to bring ancient Thrace out of its marginality in Western scholarship. The Preface states that the focus is on the new discoveries of Bulgarian archaeology and the incorporation of the new data in Thracian studies. It says nothing about the difficult choices made or what this companion is actually about,¹ but is possible to infer that this endeavour seeks to emancipate, sometimes obviously, sometimes implicitly, contemporary academic studies on Thracian antiquity from the theories of the Bulgarian Thracological School. Active in the 1970s and 1980s, this School imposed its readings on a great number of archaeological finds and produced a great amount of popular knowledge filling up the national discourse with pride. *A Companion to Ancient Thrace* is divided into five sections with 29 chapters whose content makes visible a new set of questions posed on Thrace in antiquity as a whole.

Part I. 'Thrace and the Thracians', consists of three chapters. 'The Introduction to Studying Ancient Thrace' (N. Theodossiev) is rather indistinct as it lacks the reflexivity characteristic of this kind of analyses – questions of methodology, the institutional organisation of historical and archaeological scholarship producing knowledge on antiquity in different ideological contexts. Critical views already exist and they are important in order to clarify the use of concepts that explain the various phenomena.² At least it is clear today that different contexts generate different types of knowledge: the context of the knowledge about ancient Thrace in the Mycenaean age is not the same as the context creating 20th-century knowledge before and after the Second World War in Bulgaria and beyond.

This long view approach to studying Thrace in antiquity – an outdated intellectual conception in itself – is not, however, an obstacle to a more constructivist and instrumentalist approach to research in the next two chapters, 'Geography' (J. Bouzek and D. Graninger) and 'Ethnicity and Ethne' (Graninger). They reveal explicitly the fundamental understanding that the geographical and historical realities are not self-evident and that they are understood through different contexts. They bring out questions on boundaries and political

¹ J. Roisman and I. Worthington (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia* (Malden, MA/Oxford 2010).

² T. Marinov, 'Ancient Thrace in the Modern Imagination'. In R. Daskalov and A. Vezekov (eds.), *Entangled Histories of the Balkans III. Shared Pasts, Disputed Legacies* (Leiden 2015), 10–117.

fragmentation of different sorts which create different layers of complexity.³ ‘Geography’ is a successful illustration of reconciling a broad synoptic view, including discussion of climate and natural resources, using two places in Thrace – Koprivlen and Apollonia Pontica – as case studies. It tests the impact of physical geography on settlement life and networks of communication and exchange in the Late Bronze Age in a local context. ‘Ethnicity and Ethne’ is rightly critical of primordialist blood-and-soil models of the study of ethnic groups still prevailing in many academic fields including Bulgarian scholarship. Based on radical revisions in the research of ethnicity in the ancient Mediterranean this chapter is in position to affect fundamentally this perspective with the new instrumentalist models of study. Based on case studies different kinds of synchrony and diachrony in the nature of sources can be clarified, as well as the place of Thracian antiquity in the entangled histories of the Balkans.⁴

Part II, ‘History’, offers in five chapters a comprehensive overview of the political history of ancient Thrace from the ‘Early History of Thrace to the Murder of Kotys I (360 BCE)’ (M. Zahrnt), via the events leading to Koroupedion (360–281 BC) (P. Delev), the beginning of the Third Mithridatic War (281–73 BC) (Delev) and Roman Thrace (I. Lozanov), to Thrace in late antiquity (B. Dumanov). Although the historians constantly bemoan the sad state of extant sources and never miss an opportunity to note that ‘ancient Thracians had no literature, not even script – neither do we know of any Greek and Latin author who wrote about Thracian history’, they use the traditional culture-historical approach to extract ‘maximum’ information for events from uninformed, fragmented or dubious texts written by outsiders with their own perspectives on the Thracians. This constant complaint about sources reveals a lack of reflexively organised discussion on their nature. The applied culture-historical approach leads them to recording a great number of routine conflicts mentioned in many ‘sources’ (i.e. narrative texts). The competence of the authors of these sources needs to be studied as well: synchronic or diachronic to different events, they seem to supply historians with valuable ‘sources’ for the Thracian history. The applied culture-historical approach always suits the effort to testify to ‘cultural and probably also ethnic continuity leading into the Bulgarian Middle Ages’. As a whole the historians are not concerned with notions of continuity, society, culture, community, city, people, tribe or nation as phenomena, which today are considered to belong to different categories and to lead to a multi-dimensionalism of historical knowledge.

Part III ‘Evidence’ is representative of the archaeological repertoire which focuses on settlements and settlement system, dolmens and rock-cut monuments, ritual pits, tomb architecture, decoration of the Thracian chamber tombs, gold, silver and bronze vessels, adornments, pottery, inscriptions and numismatic material. From a methodological point of view there is no evidence which is neutral: the main questions are how we obtain them to represent different phenomena, what kind of knowledge they produce, who needs this knowledge, and who and how one uses it. In other words, most of the surveys lack critical discussions of the data and therefore most of them offer abundant detailed information which fails to answer the main question – evidence for what? This question is inevitably

³ On contemporary knowledge of boundaries, see F. Barth, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference* (Boston 1969).

⁴ Marinov, as in n. 2.

associated with the assessment of literary, epigraphic, numismatic and archaeological data, and the mechanisms and the limits of their use in different interpretative models.

A significant set of evidence provides knowledge about 'Settlement' (H. Popov). The focus is on the archaeological data which offers knowledge about the range of different types of settlements, characteristic for the settlement system and revealing different functions: trade operations or different manufacturing industries. This data is inevitably associated with the demographic factor which is inferred probably from Herodotus' text as 'apparently numerous Thracians'. This kind of suggestion lacks a set of demographic data and the instrument for its examination. The rightly noted unsatisfactorily documented village system marks a serious gap in the assessment of the settlement system in Thrace and its functioning. The interpretative model suggests the idea of continuity, direct or indirect. The continuity between main Thracian settlements called 'tribal centres', 'royal' residences and 'cities' is seen in the context of the agency of Macedonian rule which is much more complex phenomenon. Therefore a critical discussion on the role of Macedonia in the Balkan context is a requisite perspective.

'Dolmens and Rock-Cut Monuments' (G. Nekhrizov) and 'Ritual Pits' (R. Georgieva) are seen as complexes considered traditionally as characteristic of Thracian culture and therefore associated with cults and ritual functions. Following in general pre-war interpretations they are enriched with the Bulgarian Thracological theories associating them with the omnipresent cult of the Great Mother Goddess. In the presentation of the archaeological phenomenon called 'ritual pits' possible answers are offered – the hypothetical existence of an invisible boundary between profane and sacred, rational and irrational. The inverted commas however open up a possibility for different interpretations. Discussing critically colonisation and trade mechanisms, C. Tzochev (Chapter 27) follows different paths of interpretation of the data, in which he considers the interpretation as 'pit sanctuaries' rash. The link between these two interpretations opens up the way to a more extensive and detailed dialogue on their function in a comparative perspective.

Another set of evidence is represented by 'Tomb Architecture' (D. Stoyanova). Detailed study of the components of the Thracian tombs reveals a context of common tendencies in the eastern Mediterranean in the funerary architecture, inferring the development of local variants. Stoyanova rightly questions easy identifications of archaeological with some other kind of data (for example, the date of Seuthes III' death) but uses unquestionably the identification of the Getic centre with the so-called Helis. The essay raises the important problem concerning identifications of archaeological material with textual narratives. The other set of evidence concerns 'The Decoration of Thracian Chamber Tombs' (J. Valeva). Treated as a separate phenomenon, the interpretation focuses mainly on different kinds of symbolisms derived from Greek narrative contexts and thus follows the traditional culture-historical methodology. In the next chapter, on 'Gold, Silver, and Bronze Vessels', the same author presents them in the traditional descriptive manner, seeking to explain the local idiosyncrasies. Persian, Anatolian and Greek influences are considered to be fundamental in shaping the Thracian culture idiom.

An important set of evidence is associated with 'Adornments' (M. Tonkova). They are categorised with an emphasis on socio-political context in order to trace the major developments and influences in jewellery fashion in Thrace. This approach makes possible to reveal the characteristics of a society instead of discussing origins and influences.

The systematic study of 'Pottery' (A. Bozhkova) shows that this kind of evidence is helpful to resolve different problems concerning various changes reflecting general tendencies in the ancient Mediterranean, such as the steadiness of the market offered by the region of Thrace.

The chapter on 'Inscriptions' (D. Dana) comprises a wide spectrum of use of inscriptions, including those from the Roman period. It is the best example of presenting a type of evidence and discussing its nature. Thus, it becomes clear what kind of questions and studies might be based on it. Revealing the nature of the epigraphic data Dana questions the created and actively disseminated image of the Thracian non-literary society which fits into the pattern of the so-called 'silent people of the Mediterranean'. The chapter mobilises different kinds of inscriptions to raise questions about the spread literacy in Thrace. It concerns the diffusion of Greek language and the respective writing practices – coin legends, inscriptions, hundreds of graffiti on vessels, jewels and armour (helmets, swords, etc.). The chapter lacks, however, even a glance at the nature of the Thracian language which has been always in the discussion optics of modern linguistics.

Coinage as evidence is presented in the 'Introduction to the Numismatics of Thrace 530 BCE–46 CE' (E. Paunov). This contains a useful numismatic history of Thrace, introducing briefly the main scholarly problems and key bibliography for the numismatics of ancient Thrace. It presents chronologically in detail the royal and tribal coinage – minting, material, traffic, etc.

The six chapters in Part IV devoted to 'Influence and Interaction' are of key importance and successfully realised: Thrace was never an isolated area, therefore it is important to study the main sites of interaction – Greek colonists, Athens, Persia, Macedonia, Scythia and the Celtic presence in this part of the Balkans. The first, 'The Greek Colonists' (M. Damyanov) is devoted to issues of Greek colonisation, revealing various mechanisms of community coexistence: after centuries it became clear that the Greeks were no longer 'colonists' but had become just another native community. In 'Athens' (M. Sears) another set of evidence discusses processes of hybridisation resulting in manifold cultural entanglement. 'Persia' (M. Vassileva) considers more complicated influences based on interaction between the Achaemenid and the Greek society in the formation of the Odrysian kingdom. It opens up a perspective to a more detailed study of the gift-exchange phenomenon debated elsewhere in this volume. Gift-exchange might be considered as an essential prerequisite for establishing commercial relations, as was the case of Greek colonisation. (Tzochet). An important comparison is presented in 'Thracian and Macedonian Kingship' (W. Greenwalt) where political structures and religion as ideology are discussed. It opens up a perspective for the necessary scholarly dialogue between scholars concerning the role of Macedonia and its interrelations with Thrace. The chapter on 'Thracians and Scythians: Tensions, Interactions and Osmosis' (D. Braund) puts into a broad perspective interactions between Thrace and Scythia. They are framed by the story of the Scythian king Scyles and his Thracian associations and address critically the nature of the Greek written evidence. The proposed interpretative models go beyond revealing simple conflicts and retelling the mythical narratives of ancient authors to approach their historicity. The chapter on 'Celts' (J. Emilov) presents the archaeological evidence, properly studied, which gives ground to reformulate the problems imagined by the ancient written sources into an interpretation more relevant to the situation. The author successfully approaches the processes of 'amalgamation' rather than the processes of separation.

Some contributions to Part V, 'Controversies', reveal the much needed conversation on methodological insufficiency of the research of Thracian society. They show that the contemporary instruments of research in Bulgarian scholarship are informed theoretically by the culture-historical school alone, focused exclusively on ethnic interpretation of archaeological data and identifications through external criteria found in Greek and Roman narratives. Literary sources, created in different times and different contexts offer partial truths about Thracian society. It is assumed that they were often inadequate to actual practices in Thrace and have to be checked against adequately interpreted archaeological, numismatic, epigraphic and linguistic data. But this methodologically outdated way of associating ancient texts with archaeological artefacts is still in use – for example, the name of a *polis* found in an ancient text as a *hapax* remains unquestioned in all articles and, lacking serious argument, is still omnipresent.

The first three chapters isolate critically the approach of the Thracological School from the 1970s and 1980s, when it was in a rushed quest to establish the uniqueness of Thracian culture. In line with this already old-fashioned culture-historical approach, Seuthopolis, excavated in the 1950s, was interpreted as royal residence and was incorporated in many studies. It suited well this methodology, whose main purpose was to outline the distinctive features of Thracian royal-ness. Following influential Soviet philologists and archaeologists whose focus was mainly on ethno-genetic issues, Bulgarian scholarship stimulated the intensively developed discourse on the spiritual uniqueness of Thracian culture in juxtaposition with *polis*-based society. This uniqueness is imagined as a centralised territorial monarchy, extracted exclusively from literary sources, but also as a non-literary society where orality was valorised as a conscious choice of the ruling elite, becoming a mark of the aristocratic core of Thracian culture, i.e. a closed society accessible only to initiates, different in all ways from the 'classical world' (Dana). The Social Life of Thrace' (Z. Archibald) is a much broader topic but the main critical trends mentioned above are revealed here too. The discussion in 'Urbanization' (E. Nankov) is in the same critical vein. Adopting a function-oriented approach to the processes of urbanisation and different urban forms, Nankov rightly questions some interpretations informed by the culture-historical method. He discusses a number of settlements, such as Philipopolis, Drongilon, Kabyle, *emporion* Pistiros and the so-called royal cities (Seuthopolis, 'Helis', the estate of Kozi Gramadi). Applying more functional approaches the character of urban structures might be seen in another perspective. The chapter on 'Trade' (Tzochev) questions the encapsulation of the 'royal' economy developed by the Bulgarian Thracology School in favour of an interpretation, based on the author's analysis of market places, processes of monetisation and commoditisation, which reveals a much more market-oriented situation. His analyses rely mostly on the internal dynamics of Thracian society and the complexity of relations between royal authority, civic bodies and private actors. These three chapters push the debate in a desirable direction through critical discussion of all types of evidence. Thus the preferred function-oriented approach turns the perspective of research in a new direction.

'Warfare' (T. Stoyanov) proposes a detailed overview of war artefacts, war strategies and tactics evidenced in archaeological sites and written texts in a more descriptive manner inferring Macedonian influence. It lacks the critical potential to be fully understood as controversial. In 'Religion' K. Rabadjiev presents historically the Thracian religion as cults and practices based on archaeological and written texts. They illustrate a heterogeneous

society dependent on different political interactions of its elite, adopting and adapting foreign ideas and practices. The urban centres are differentiated from rural communities which display more traditional cults.

In conclusion, this volume offers comprehensive and up-to-date essays on a variety of historical and socio-cultural issues that represent mainly contemporary Bulgarian scholarship on ancient Thrace. It will stimulate further development of more critical and reflexive analyses, overcoming out-of-date paradigms and accepting newly developed methodological instruments. In this sense it largely fulfils what it promises and reveals potential for further bridging of the methodological insufficiency clearly inferred in a great number of texts. This is an invitation to specialists – Bulgarian and foreign – to discuss further what categories of study are needed instead in place of a descriptive presentation of facts. The *Companion* gives archaeology the opportunity to join successfully the research field of ancient studies of the eastern Mediterranean, overcoming the methodological ‘zones of silence’ characterising the so-called period of transition in Bulgaria.¹

New Bulgarian University, Sofia

Tsvete Lazova

P. Werner, *Der Anu-Adad-Tempel in Assur*, Baudenkmäler assyrischer Zeit 15, Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 145, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 2016, xi+185 pp., illustrations, 95 plates (3 in colour), 5 plans in end pocket. Cased. ISBN 978-3-447-10581-1/ISSN 0342-4464

This volume represents a revision of Walther Andrae’s original publication of the results of the German excavations of the Anu-Adad Temple in Assur. As Peter Werner points out (p. 4) this had in fact been the first of the original publications of the results of the German expedition at Assur.¹ It should also be noted that the treatment of the sanctuary’s older phases had been the subject of Andrae’s dissertation.²

In the introduction (pp. 1–10), W. first describes the course of excavations, which lasted from May until October 1905. He also mentions that A.H. Layard and H. Rassam³ had already conducted soundings in this area of the site before. Whether the seated statue discovered in the course of the early British excavations was actually discovered in this area, as stated by W. (p. 1), is doubtful, however, as Andrae⁴ believed the statue to have been unearthed in the vicinity of the *Tabīra* gate located close to the city’s north-west corner.⁵ W. then goes on to explain the manner in which the archaeological features were recorded and where the limitations and problems lie before presenting an overview of

¹ M. Todorova, ‘Historiography of the Countries of Eastern Europe: Bulgaria’. *American Historical Review* 4 (1992), 1105–17.

² W. Andrae, *Der Anu-Adad-Tempel in Assur* (Leipzig 1909).

³ W. Andrae, *Der Anu-Adad-Tempel in Assur. Die ältere Anlage* (Dissertation, Leipzig 1909).

⁴ Cf. A.H. Layard, *Nineveh and its Remains...*, vol. 2 (London 1849), 50–52

⁵ W. Andrae: *Die Festungswerke von Assur* (Berlin 1913), 38; *Das wiedererstandene Assur. Zweite, durchgesehene und erweiterte Auflage*, 2nd ed. (Munich 1977), n. 9.

⁶ It should also be pointed out that this statue may not represent Shalmaneser III, but the god Kididu (cf. J.E. Reade, ‘Not Shalmaneser but Kidudu’. *BaghdMitt* 17 [1986], 299–300).