



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Ben Raynor

Alexander I of Molossia and the creation of Apeiros

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **47 • 2017**

Seiten / Pages **243–270**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34780/chiron.v47i0.1009> • URN: <https://doi.org/10.34780/chiron.v47i0.1009>

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/index.php/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

©2020 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: <https://www.dainst.org>

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

BEN RAYNOR

Alexander I of Molossia and the creation of Apeiros

1. *Old and New Histories of Epeiros and Molossia*

Epeiros, sometimes ‹Apeiros› in the sources, was a region in the northwest of the ancient Balkan peninsula.¹ It ran roughly from the Gulf of Ambrakia in the south to Apollonia in the north, and as far inland as the Pindos mountain range.² Epeiros was a region of substantial political and ethnic variety. For instance, Thucydides (2. 80. 5–6), when relating the local forces campaigning with the Spartan admiral Knemos in Akarnania in the summer of 429, describes a variety of ‹barbarian› contingents from Epeiros, some coming from communities with kings (Molossians, Atintanians, Parauaians, Orestians) and others kingless (Chaonians, Thesprotians). Three of these ethne came to dominate the region in the fourth, third, and second centuries: the Molossians, the Thesprotians, and the Chaonians. The Molossians and their ruling house, the Aiakids, appear most frequently in our standard narratives: Olympias, mother of Alexander the Great, and Pyrrhos, enemy of Rome, were both Aiakids.³ But these and other larger groups were themselves made up of many smaller communities, whose ethnics appear in the epigraphic record.⁴ We know little enough about the nature and membership of ethne in this region, either the larger groups or the smaller ones which together constituted them. The ethnos is now generally thought of not as a primitive form of community based on immutable blood ties, but as a form of political and social organisation common in certain regions and perhaps constituted as a geographical unit and locus of local identification, rather than as a descent

All dates BC. I would like to thank ROBIN OSBORNE, PETER THONEMANN, ANEURIN ELLIS-EVANS, and MATTHEW HOSTY, who all read and commented on drafts of this piece, as well as the editors and reviewer for Chiron who made many helpful suggestions.

¹ General works on Epeiros: CROSS 1932; FRANKE 1955; LÉVÊQUE 1957; HAMMOND 1967, 1994b; CABANES 1976; DAVIES 2000; FUNKE 2000a; MEYER 2013.

² FUNKE et al. 2004, 338.

³ Aiakids and Molossians: CROSS 1932, 100–102; HAMMOND 1967, 531–540; MEYER 2013, esp. 46–60; ead. 2015, esp. 300–305. Olympias: BERVE 1926, II 283–288 no. 581; CARNEY 2000, 62–67, 85–88, 119–123; HECKEL 2006, 181–183. Pyrrhos: LÉVÊQUE 1957, 1997.

⁴ DAVIES 2000, 256; MEYER 2013, esp. 49–52, 91–113. CABANES 1976, 135–141 listed 157 known ethne for Epeiros in antiquity.

group.⁵ Whatever the particulars, it seems clear that Epeiros was a region of multiple nested tiers of political and social units, with larger ethne formed from a number of smaller ones. Community leadership, organisation, and membership of larger groups were all subject to change by historical forces. It was therefore also a region where an individual might have multiple nested possible identities to which they could subscribe, with these identities and their salience to individuals and groups also subject to change.⁶

Although the Aiakid monarchy of Molossia dominates the literary sources, Epeiros has interested many scholars as an apparent early ground breaker in Greek federal political structures. The commonly accepted narrative of Epeirote history, established by NICHOLAS HAMMOND and PIERRE CABANES in the 1960s and 1970s and chiefly based on epigraphy, holds that by the early fourth century the Molossian state was a *koinon* possessing federal institutions, including a magistrate known as *προστάτας* of the Molossians, a secretary, and a council.⁷ These represented the Molossians and held in check the power of the kings. The Molossian *koinon* was then replaced, during or after the reign of Alexander I (ruled ca. 343/342–331/330), with a larger state, headed by the Molossian king but incorporating a wider group of peoples.⁸ This state, called in antiquity *Ἀπειρος*, *the Molossians and their allies*, or *those of the Apeirotes who are allied*, and also *the Epirote Alliance* or the *Epirote Symmachy* by modern scholars, also limited the king's powers and possessed federal institutions.⁹ This state was replaced after the death of the last Aiakid in 232 with an Epeirote *koinon* with *republican* institutions (such as an *ekklesia*, a *synedrion*, and a *strategos*) which incorporated Molossians, Thesprotians, and Chaonians.¹⁰ Therefore Molossians and Epeirotes appear as constant innovators in Greek federalism.

⁵ HATZOPOULOS 1996, I 103; id. 2006, 69; MORGAN 2003; MEYER 2013, 50, n. 100; ead. 2015, 301–303; introduction to BECK – FUNKE 2015. The term *ethnos* has broad meaning; FRASER 2009, 1–12.

⁶ Recent work on ethnicity and ethnogenesis in the ancient world has stressed the discursive, socially constructed nature of ancient identity: e.g. HALL 1997, 2002; MORGAN 2003; LURAGHI 2008.

⁷ HAMMOND 1967, 1994b; CABANES 1976, 1981, 1997, 2004; FUNKE 2000a, 2000b; DAVIES 2000. PICCININI 2015 provides an excellent overview of scholarship up to and including MEYER 2013.

⁸ FRANKE 1955, 36–78 thought Olympias ca. 329–325 instigated a loose alliance under Molossian leadership; HAMMOND 1967, esp. 525–563 thought a long-lasting alliance among the states in the region emerged ca. 330; CABANES 1976, 151–185 settled for ca. 334–328 as a date for the development from a strong federal Molossia to a strong federal *Apeiros*; id. 1997, 83f. gives ca. 330; GAUTHIER 1979, 122 preferred a model similar to FRANKE's for a Molossian-led alliance; DAKARIS 1989, 56f., LÉVÊQUE 1997, 74, 78f. and FUNKE 2000a, 185 preferred a date under Alexander I for the emergence of an *Epeirote Symmachy* (DAKARIS) or a new federal state (LÉVÊQUE and FUNKE).

⁹ FUNKE 2000a gives a strong expression of the federal interpretation.

¹⁰ HAMMOND 1967, 595–635; CABANES 1976, 198–216, 353–389; MEYER 2013, 130–135.

ELIZABETH MEYER thoroughly re-examined the epigraphic evidence which formed the basis for this narrative. Reassessing the dating criteria, particularly the regional development of letter-forms, she has re-dated many key inscriptions and offered a new interpretation of Molossian history.¹¹ In MEYER's view, the inscriptions show not a federal government in fourth century Molossia, but instead a rudimentary board of magistrates drawn from Molossian communities around Dodona, probably created by the Molossian king to help run the sanctuary. This amphictyony-like organisation played no significant political role and exercised no restraint on the king's powers. In the late fourth and early third centuries, the Molossians established enduring alliances with some of their neighbours, including the Thesprotians and the Chaonians. This was no expanded koinon, but a group of independent polities united under the leadership of the Molossian monarch. These alliances contributed to a growing sense of a regional, Epeirote identity. This identity underpinned but did not cause the existence of an Epeirote federal state after 232, which was created due to a chance combination of circumstances which wiped out the Aiakid royal house, necessitating a change in governance.

MEYER's study is a welcome challenge to the commonly held narrative of Epeirote history. Her re-datings of key inscriptions seem persuasive, and her arguments fit better with the image from the literary sources of a political life dominated by the monarch.¹² There are, however, unresolved problems in MEYER's study, particularly for the turbulent period between Alexander I becoming king of Molossia in 343/342, and the death of Pyrrhos in 272. In MEYER's analysis, in this period the Molossians acquired a greater sense of regional, Epeirote identity alongside a growing sense of Molossian identity.¹³ MEYER argues that this explains the increasing references to Epeiros/Apeiros and Epeirotes/Apeirotes in our sources, and the use of these terms alongside the continued existence of the Molossians as a political unit.¹⁴

MEYER's arguments regarding the roots of Epeirote «ethnogenesis» seem plausible, in particular that regular intervention by Macedon in the period ca. 317–297 encouraged feelings of regional solidarity and resistance.¹⁵ However, her reconstruction also seems incomplete. DAVIES noted, in a survey of the epigraphic evidence, that processes of state and community formation in this region at this time are likely to spring from a mixture of top-down and bottom-up imperatives.¹⁶ MEYER's analysis

¹¹ Dating criteria: MEYER 2013, 18–45. Seven key implications of re-dating: 46–113. New history of Molossia: 114–135. GAUTHIER 1979, 123f. had already noted problems with CABANES' dating of some inscriptions.

¹² Though see D'ALESSANDRO 2015 for a less positive assessment.

¹³ MEYER 2013, 64–79, 125–129.

¹⁴ The Molossian koinon continues to appear in the epigraphic record in the late fourth and third centuries: MEYER 2013, 79–90.

¹⁵ MEYER 2013, 72–79. Compare the role that Thessalian occupation played in the development of a regional Phokian identity at the end of the sixth century: MCINERNEY 2001.

¹⁶ DAVIES 2000, 257.

suggests one important factor: increasing regional cooperation in the face of outside pressure creating strong bonds which forged an ‹Epeirote› community. In MEYER's account, however, the Molossian kings played a fairly passive role in this process. Alexander I and particularly Pyrrhos provided capable military leadership which helped to quicken the emergence of a strong regional identity, but did little themselves to encourage this.

Yet the Aiakid kings were powerful forces in the region, with the ability to affect significant change in the political geography of the region.¹⁷ Did royal policy perhaps play a greater role in the formation of ‹Apeiros› and ‹the Apeirotes› than MEYER allows? If so, what form did it take, and how do our sources record its effects? To answer these questions, a re-examination of key evidence for possible transformations in the nature of the Molossian state in the second half of the fourth century will first be required.

2. Did ‹Apeiros› emerge as a state in the fourth century?

The first issue to address is whether or not Apeiros/Epeiros, formerly a purely geographical term,¹⁸ emerged as a political unit in the fourth century, and if it did, when that happened and what the nature of the transition from Molossia to Apeiros was. As surveyed above, many would argue for the transformation around 330 of a Molossian state with a federal government headed by a monarch into a still federal but larger Epeirote state. MEYER, on the other hand, argues that Molossia remained Molossia until 232, and no Epeirote state emerged in the fourth century. Whether we think there was a new state with a new name from ca. 330 has major implications for reading the evidence.

A key matter for approaching the evidence in question is how to interpret toponyms and ethnics. It is still commonly held that political communities are exclusively referred to by ethnics, not by toponyms; ‹the Athenians›, never ‹Athens›.¹⁹ When toponyms appear, they are geographical terms only. The reality is more complicated. As shown by DAVID WHITEHEAD over 20 years ago and discussed at length in ‹An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis›, in multiple kinds of sources (ancient writers, epigraphy, coinage), Greek poleis are named by toponym, not by ethnic, in contexts which clearly indicate that the political community rather than a place is meant.²⁰ For example, in the Athenian tribute lists and assessment decrees, thirty-two Athenian allies are recorded sometimes by toponym, sometimes by ethnic, while fifty-two are recorded by toponym alone. In book 5 of Aristotle's ‹Politics›, the standard way to

¹⁷ GAUTHIER 1979, 123–125 argued for a significant role for the Aiakid monarchs at least in expanding Molossian territory.

¹⁸ FRANKE 1955, 3–30; GAUTHIER 1979, 120; PICCININI 2015, 173f.

¹⁹ This goes back at least to FINLEY 1963, 35.

²⁰ WHITEHEAD 1996; HANSEN – NIELSEN 2004, 55–57, 104, 112, 147.

refer to a polis is ἐν + toponym in the dative, and throughout the book the use is clearly in the political sense.

The same applies to non-polis states, such as Macedonia/the Macedonians and Epeiros/the Epeirotes. FANULA PAPAZOGLU and MILTIADES HATZOPOULOS have established the equivalence of «the Macedonians», «the Macedonian ethnos», and «the cities of Macedonia», on the one hand, and «Macedonia» and «the land of the Macedonians» on the other for literary and epigraphic evidence from Antigonid Macedonia.²¹ To the Hellenistic examples one might add a reference in book 7 of Aristotle's «Politics». In a discussion [1324b 10–22] of how military strength was held in high esteem «in all ethne» (ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι πᾶσι), he relates how «there was at one time in Macedonia a law that a man who had never killed an enemy must wear a halter (instead of a belt)» (ἦν δέ ποτε καὶ περὶ Μακεδονίαν νόμος τὸν μηθένα ἀπεκταγκότα πολέμιον ἄνδρα περιεζῶσθαι τὴν φορβειάν). In a discussion about the laws of various ethne, alongside mention of a plethora of peoples not places, the toponym here clearly means the political community, not the region. Examples can be found for Epeiros too. In his «Library of History», Diodoros in his narrative for 317/316 relates (19. 36. 4) how «those of the Epeirotes who returned to their homelands revolted against their absent king, condemned him to exile by common decision, and made an alliance with Kassandros» (οἱ δὲ χωρισθέντες τῶν Ἑπειρωτῶν εἰς τὰς πατρίδας κατεστασίασαν ἀπόντα τὸν βασιλέα καὶ κοινῶν δόγματι φυγὴν αὐτοῦ καταγόντες πρὸς Κάσσανδρον ἐποιήσαντο συμμαχίαν). Shortly after this, he relates (19. 36. 5) how «Kassandros received Epeiros into his alliance» (Κασάνδρου δὲ παραλαβόντος τὴν Ἑπειρον τῇ συμμαχίᾳ). Whether or not the details of Diodoros' narrative are correct is debated (see below). But it is clear that «the Epeirotes» who make an alliance and the «Epeiros» received into alliance in passages in close textual and chronological proximity have to mean the same thing for Diodoros: a political community. Any other conclusion would go against the clear logic of the text. It would also represent a highly unusual use of the terminology of alliance for Diodoros: in the 208 other uses of συμμαχία and cognate terms in books 16–20, Diodoros refers only to individuals, political communities, or specific military contingents fighting or promising to fight together.²²

Therefore, it was perhaps the norm in Greek antiquity to use ethnics to identify political communities. But toponyms performed the same function in a multitude of media: this usage was reasonably common, and could be recognised for what it was by ancient observers. Whether the use of a toponym was primarily political or primarily geographical could be deduced from the context. But it is critical for the Epeirote evidence to recognise that toponyms could and did at times denote political communities of all kinds in sources from antiquity.

To return to whether a state called Epeiros existed in the fourth century, there are only a handful of pieces of evidence. One is a theorodokoi list from Argos which dates

²¹ PAPAZOGLU 1983; HATZOPOULOS 1996, 219–221.

²² See end of article.

to ca. 334–324 and probably records delegations sent out to announce the festival of Zeus at Nemea.²³ Theorodokoi lists record the individuals responsible for receiving the theoi of major sanctuaries when they visited to announce festivals and invite delegates. The relevant section of the list (col. I, l. 10–16) reads:²⁴

- 10 [Ἀμβρ]ακία· [Φ]ορβάδας
 [Ἄπε]ιρος· Κλεοπάτρα
 [Φοι]νίκα· Σατυρῖνος, Πυλάδας Κάρχαξ
 [Κόρκ]υρα· [...ca. 6...]ίδας, Αἰσχρίων Τεύθραντος
 [Ἄπο]λλωνία· Δω[...]θεος
 15 [...ca. 7...]N[.]ΝΟΣ
 [Ἐν] Κυραναία[ι]

This list differs substantially from an earlier document. The travels of the envoys who, ca. 356–355, announced the festival of Asklepios at Epidauros produced quite a different record.²⁵

²³ Theorodokoi and theoi: PERLMAN 2000; RUTHERFORD 2013. On the date, the only fixed point is the presence of Kleopatra, daughter of Philip II and Olympias and sister of Alexander the Great: BERVE 1926, II 212f. no. 433; CARNEY 2000, 75f., 89–94, 123–128; HECKEL 2006, 90. In 336 Kleopatra married her uncle Alexander I of Molossia: Diod. Sic. 16. 91. 4–6; Justin 9. 6. 1–3. It is thought that Kleopatra remained in Molossia as ruler after Alexander's death in winter 331/330. CHARNEUX 1966a thought Olympias quickly ousted Kleopatra, dating the list's delegation to 331–330; followed by MILLER 1988, 161f. HAMMOND 1980a, 473–476 thought Kleopatra remained in Epeiros ca. 330–324; then Olympias came to Molossia while Kleopatra went to Macedonia; followed by MEYER 2013, 64. PERLMAN 2000, 102 gives 331/330 as the list's terminus post quem. However, Kleopatra could have been her husband's regent from the moment he embarked for Italy in 334. The careers of Epeirote, Illyrian, and Macedonian royal women in this period show it was hardly unusual for them to assume leadership positions, especially when royal men were absent: CARNEY 2000. The date for Hand One (which inscribed the northwest Greece section) should be ca. 334–324.

²⁴ I have used PERLMAN 2000, Ep. Cat. A.1. CHARNEUX 1966a was the initial edition, and had the polity in line 13 as [Κασσωπ]α, with [Κόρκ]υρα·ΝΑΙ[...] in line 16. At J. BOUSQUET's suggestion, he later (1966b, 710) suggested [Κόρκ]υρα for line 13, with line 16 [Ἐν Κ]υραναία[ι]. HAMMOND 1980a, 14f.; id. 1980b, 472f. preferred [Κεμα]ρα for line 13; followed by DAVIES 2000, 248. BOUSQUET's suggestion has been vindicated by the presence in a later list from Nemea (dating ca. 323–316) of Αἰσχρίων Τεύθραντος as theorodokos «Ἐν Κορκύραι»: MILLER 1988; PERLMAN 2000, Ep. Cat. N.1: on the date, RAYNOR 2016, 235f. [Κόρκ]υρα in line 13 of the Argive list is therefore correct: CABANES 1976, 117–120, 173; MEYER 2013, 64–66. CABANES 1969 proposed a restoration of [Μνασαλκ]ίδας after [Κόρκ]υρα, based on the appearance in the ca. 356–355 theorodokoi list from Epidauros of a Μνασαλκίδας as theorodokos for Corcyra (see below n. 25); DAUX 1971, 355 noted that names ending -ίδας are too numerous to make this suggestion decisive.

²⁵ IG IV² 1, 95; PERLMAN 2000, Ep. Cat. E.2. On the date, PERLMAN 2000, 70–72.

- 20 Λευκάς· Τιμοφράδης
 Πάλαιρος· Λεόντιος
 Ἄνακτόριον· Ἀριστίων Περιάνδρο[υ]
 Ἄπειρος· Γέρων, Ἀριστόδαμος
 Πανδοσία· Διόσζοτος
- 25 Κασσώπα· Σκέπας, Ἀριστόδαμος
 Θεσπρωτοί· Πετόας, Σίμακος
 Ποινωνός· Ἄδματος
 Κόρκυρα· Μνασαλκίδας, Ἀντιρήιδας
 Χαονία· Δόροπος
- 30 Ἄρτιχία· Σχιδᾶς
 Μολοσσοί· Θᾶρυψ
 Ἀμβρακία· {Φορβάδας} {Τιμογένης}
- [...]
- 73 Ἄπειρος· Κασώ<π>ας²⁶

In this earlier list, «Apeiros» is one of several geographical headings, and marked as such on the stone by larger text. Under this heading are listed communities, including the area's three main ethne: the Thesprotians (Thesprotioi), Chaonians (Chaonia), and Molossians (Molossoi, with their king Tharyps [II] as theorodokos). In the Argive list, however, «Apeiros» appoints Kleopatra as theorodokos, the Molossians and Thesprotians are absent, while the Chaonians may be represented by their main city Phoinike.

CABANES thought these differences showed that, between the two delegations, Apeiros had replaced Molossia and absorbed Thesprotia to create a new federal state.²⁷ MEYER raised several objections.²⁸ In the «Delphi Great List» of ca. 230–210, Dodona appoints a theorodokos, when at the time the political entity was not called Dodona but the Epeirote koinon or the Epeirote ethnos. Therefore, one cannot always expect exact correlation between an entry in a theorodokoi list and the name of the state. Nor do the lists reveal the nature of any named community. Such lists do not represent complete catalogues of polities for a given region: if communities could get missed

²⁶ Ἀριστίων Περιάνδρο[υ] in l. 22 has been considered a later addition to the stone (e.g. DAVIES 2000, 247, following HILLER's initial publication); PERLMAN 2000, 182 refutes this. The theorodokoi for Ambrakia in l. 32 are later additions, PERLMAN's l. 81–82. PERLMAN 2000, 182 read [Θ]ουδ[- -] below l. 82, possibly traces of the original theorodokos' name. The names next to Ἄπειρος on l. 23 were added later: HILLER has these in rasura, but PERLMAN 2000, 183 detected no concavity. These names are connected to l. 73, included here as a relevant later addition. This seems to have been an update to Kassopa's theorodokoi. A reading of Γέρων Ἀριστόδαμου led HAMMOND 1967, 518 to suggest the addition of the son of one of the original theorodokoi. DAVIES 2000, 247 suggested Geron instead replaced his father. PERLMAN 2000, 180–184 restored Γέρων, Ἀριστόδαμος and suggested a Geron replaced the other theorodokos Skepas.

²⁷ CABANES 1976, 117–120; FUNKE 2000a, 2000b.

²⁸ MEYER 2013, 64–66.

out, the absence of the Thesprotians need not be significant. MEYER instead suggests that Apeiros in the Argive list is a geographical indicator of the area the theoroi had passed through, reflecting political disorder in the area: this was the best way that the theoroi could describe where they had been. To summarise in MEYER's own words: «the theorodokos was royal, the people were Molossian, the area was <Apeiros>, and the unnamed political entity, in both 356/5 and 330, was a kingdom.»²⁹

MEYER is right to think that these lists are not good evidence for the political status of visited communities.³⁰ Her caution with regard to the status of the Thesprotians is also well founded. We do not even know that all communities which theoroi visited were inscribed in the lists. Therefore, we cannot read much into the presence or absence of communities in one list compared to another.

However, Apeiros is not likely to be a geographical indicator in the Argive list for Nemea, but rather the name of a political entity. MEYER's argument about Dodona in the Delphi list shows that we should not assume that an entry in a theorodokoi list was not standing in for the larger political community of which it was a part. In the Delphi list, Dodona stands in for the koinon of the Epeirotes. One might also point to Phoinike in the Argive list, a city in Chaonia which seems to stand in for the Chaonians. But such examples only indicate some caution is required when deciding whether or not list entries were polities: they do not prove that Apeiros in the Argive list was not itself a polity. It is also worth noting that when entries stand in for other entities, they seem to be smaller, constituent parts of that larger entity, like Dodona or Phoinike. They do not seem to be related toponyms coextensive with or larger than the entity for which they are standing in, as «Apeiros» in the Argive list would be in MEYER's view. Such examples are also exceptions: the majority of entries in known theorodokoi lists can be verified in other sources as names for political entities, not names standing in for a different political entity.³¹ These are mostly Greek poleis, but do include theorodokoi for kingdoms identified by a toponym, such as the king «Perdikkas» (III) being theorodokos for «Macedonia» in a list from Epidauros dating to 360.³²

If we consider what purpose theoric delegations served, we have even more reason to think that a name recorded with one or more theorodokoi was usually a political community. Regular delegations of theoroi formed part of the <social> relations between Greek communities.³³ Such relations helped create networks of Hellenic communities united, in this case, by common participation in prestigious festivals.³⁴ The effort that communities administering sanctuaries put into displaying the theorodokoi lists on stone attests to the importance attached to developing and (perhaps more im-

²⁹ MEYER 2013, 65. GAUTHIER 1979, 122f. also thought Apeiros here had to be «un pays», not «un État».

³⁰ RAYNOR 2016, 239–241.

³¹ HANSEN – NIELSEN 2004, 105.

³² PERLMAN 2000 Ep. Cat. E.1, l. 9 Μακεδονία· Περδίκκας. Date: RAYNOR 2016, 233f.

³³ GIOVANNINI 1977.

³⁴ RUTHERFORD 2013, 281–303; RAYNOR 2016, 246–253.

portantly) displaying a wide range of contacts.³⁵ Their primary role was honorary: the sanctuary demonstrated the importance of their festival by showing the large number of participants, while the theorodokoi gained prestige through a permanent display in stone of their role representing their community in the social networks created by theoric delegations.

Generally, then, the entries in theorodokoi lists are not mere toponyms, but rather political communities integrated into these networks. These communities could be referred to by ethnics (Θεσπρωτοί or Μολοσσοί in the Epidaurian list) or by toponyms (see Χαονία or Ἀμβρακία in the same list). Some lists use exclusively toponyms, like the Argive list for Nemea. But unless we have good reason to think otherwise, we can assume that an entry in a theorodokoi list clearly identifies the community to whom the community controlling the sanctuary had sent theoroi. Cases like Dodona in the Delphi list are exceptions, and can generally be explained by the specific circumstances. Dodona was included in the Delphi list because of the prestige of the sanctuary of Zeus there. Dodona had by ca. 230–210 become more clearly identified as a prestigious regional centre through monumental building programmes, probably beginning in the early third century and sponsored by the Aiakid kings, and by becoming the site of the Naia, a new high-profile penteteric festival.³⁶ This investment in the sanctuary will have raised the profile of the site in inter-community networks, particularly those created by delegations of theoroi, and encouraged its inclusion in the list instead of a term more directly referencing the Epeirote koinon. This way, Delphi benefitted from displaying a link with a prestigious sanctuary, while the Epeirote koinon had the prestige of the sanctuary they controlled enhanced.

Given the role of theoric delegations in building relationships between specific communities, would Kleopatra have been happy being portrayed not as a key link between the sanctuary of Zeus at Nemea and her community, as was usual for such lists, but as an individual unattached to any polity in a vaguely labelled region? Perhaps she would never have seen the list, but others from the area could have. The compilers of the list would not have wanted to risk displeasing a queen of Molossia and sister to Alexander the Great by portraying her more shabbily than their other theorodokoi. Her ability to act as a theorodokos here at all is a further indication of her pre-eminence in the region, given how unusual it is to find women in this role. Given that these lists were meant to honour theorodokoi, we can assume that they are portrayed in ways that the lists' compilers felt would please them. Kleopatra appears as theorodokos for

³⁵ The importance accorded to displaying such texts has been noted for proxenoi lists: MACK 2015.

³⁶ Dodona remains incompletely excavated. Very modest remains have been attributed to the fourth century, including a small temple or naiskos to Zeus and a wall surrounding the temenos: DAKARIS 1971; VOUTIRAS 2004, 241 f.; MOUSTAKIS 2006, 60–85; MEYER 2013, 34 f., 126. Third century building programmes included a bouleuterion, a prytaneion, and temples to Themis, Herakles, and Dione: DAKARIS 1971, 51–58; DIETERLE 2007, 105–153. On the Naia: CABANES 1988. Third century Dodona attracted a wider range of visitors: MEYER 2013, 103 f. n. 288.

Apeiros because the compilers of the list thought this was the appropriate way to honour her. Altogether, we need a better explanation of «Apeiros» in the Argive list than as a placeholder for a politically unstable area.

We should probably see «Apeiros» here as a polity, like most other named entities in the lists, but with a name drawing favourably upon the term's geographical associations. Kleopatra represented «Apeiros», one of several polities in this region. If someone reading the list saw «Apeiros» and thought, based on the term's previous meaning, that it referred to a polity extending over the entire region, then this could only be positive for Kleopatra. She would presumably not object to anyone overestimating the extent of her influence. Since the list was meant to honour theorodokoi and the sanctuary, its compilers are unlikely to have avoided ambiguous terminology if it suited all parties. This explanation integrates the probability that «Apeiros» in the list represents a political entity with a better appreciation for the role of the theorodokoi lists and their potential ambiguities than previous explanations. Certainly there could be significant differences between the «facts on the ground» the theoroi encountered and the «official facts» written up in the lists. But these differences are less likely to emerge from uncertainty over how to record a theoretic mission than from a desire to take advantage of ambiguities, within the limits of plausibility, to represent theorodokoi and their communities in ways beneficial to all concerned.

Despite the ambiguities of these lists, then, they indicate the existence of a state named Apeiros in the late 330s–early 320s. One piece of evidence also firmly points in this direction, and dates the existence of such a state to before the death of Alexander I: coinage «of the Apeirotes».³⁷ PETER FRANKE'S 1961 study divides the coinages of Classical and Hellenistic Molossia/Epeiros into three groups: 1) the Molossian coinage

³⁷ Some other evidence is more problematic. Stephanus of Byzantium (Aristotle fr. 494 [Rose], Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀμύνται) records that Aristotle wrote a politeia of the Epeirotes, from which some have concluded that the Epeirotes must have had a politeia to study during his lifetime: FRANKE 1955, 36f.; HAMMOND 1967, 560; CABANES 1976, 172. But MEYER noted major problems with this: MEYER 2013, 66f. The single preserved quotation tells us the Amyntai were a Thesprotian ethnos, but nothing about the extent or nature of Aristotle's work. Aristotle also wrote about the politeia of the Cretans: Ar. Pol. 1271b20. But since the cities of Crete never formed a single political entity in antiquity, there is no reason to conclude that «the Epeirotes» whose politeia Aristotle studied (whoever they were) did either. A manumission decree (SGDI 1351; CABANES 1976, Ep. App. no. 55; MEYER 2013, no. 1) recording the «loosing» of one [G] rypon has been much discussed. Of 14 witnesses, seven are called Molossian, seven Thesprotian. CABANES 1976, 177–179 argued this showed the integration of the Thesprotians into the new state created ca. 330–328. However, the decree does not mention any such state, and the other evidence for the integration of the Thesprotians into Molossia (their absence from the Argive theorodokoi list for Nemea) is highly ambiguous. MEYER 2013, 35, 67 noted there is no reason to think the witnesses here were politically associated, and dates this decree ca. 350–250 from letter forms. This decree's interpretation depends upon what arguments one constructs from other evidence, and I will not discuss it further here.

in silver and bronze, struck early fourth century–ca. 330; 2) the bronze coinage of the ‹Epeirote Symmachy› (coinage bearing the legend ΑΠΕΙΡΩΤΑΝ, the abbreviation ΑΠ, or the monogram ΙΑ), ca. 330–232; and 3) the coinage in silver and bronze of the Epeirote koinon, ca. 232–168/167. Given the poor state of the evidence, the coinages were dated on historical rather than numismatic grounds. FRANKE’s analyses of the koinon coinage have been refined, bringing at least the silver down into the early third century and associating it more closely with the Third Macedonian War.³⁸ For the earlier coinages, dating remains loose; they were smaller issues and appear in hoards infrequently. The Molossian coinage in silver and bronze seems to date from the first half of the fourth century.³⁹ FRANKE arranges it into two silver groups (I–II) and two bronze groups (III–IV).⁴⁰ Group IV bears a reverse depicting a vertical lightning bolt surrounded by a wreath. It shared this reverse with FRANKE’s Group I of the coinage with ΑΠΕΙΡΩΤΑΝ or an abbreviation. This bronze series ‹of the Apeirotes›, which FRANKE divides into 12 groups, replaced or supplemented the Molossian coinage.⁴¹ FRANKE dated the introduction of the new Apeirote coinage to ca. 330/325, the date he believed the ‹Epeirote Symmachy› formed.⁴² This coinage has therefore been seen as evidence of the emergence of a new Epeirote state after Alexander I’s death.⁴³ However, an additional specimen of this series found during excavations at Kassope with strong stylistic links to mid-fourth century coins of Syracuse and, particularly, to certain silver staters of Alexander I was on the strength of these links dated to ca. 334.⁴⁴ The excavators argued for a date of ca. 342 and the accession of Alexander I for the beginning of this coinage. The find at least persuasively dates the start of the coinage ‹of the Apeirotes› to before Alexander I’s death in 331/330.⁴⁵

MEYER stated the coinage «offer[s] no independent proof of the date, or even of the creation, of the (supposed) new ‹state› of ‹Apeiros›, since the only secure stratigraphic context in which it has been found dates at least one of these issues before 334 BC».⁴⁶ This would be true if the only possible context for the creation of such a new polity were after 334. But a date earlier in the reign of Alexander I is perfectly

³⁸ PICARD – GJONGECAJ 2001; GJONGECAJ – PICARD 2005; GJONGECAJ 2007.

³⁹ The Molossian coinage: FRANKE 1961, 88f., early fourth century; HAMMOND 1967, 543f., ca. 375 or after; id., 1997, 59 suggests a gift of silver to Molossia around 373 that allowed them to start minting.

⁴⁰ FRANKE 1961, 85–106.

⁴¹ FRANKE 1961, 116–133. The coinage of the Epeirote koinon also bears the legend Apeirotan but is distinguished stylistically and by the addition of names and monograms, probably denoting mint officials. FRANKE and FUNKE 2000b, 110f. thought the Apeirotan coinage replaced the Molossian coinage; MEYER 2013, 74–76 points out that significant overlap in minting and circulation is possible.

⁴² FRANKE 1955, 36f.; id. 1961, 89–91.

⁴³ HAMMOND 1967, 537, 560; FUNKE 2000b, 110f.

⁴⁴ OIKONOMIDOU-KARAMESSINI 1984.

⁴⁵ MEYER 2013, 67, 74–77.

⁴⁶ MEYER 2013, 74f.

plausible (see below). MEYER also argues that these coins, probably issued and circulating concurrently with royal issues and the Molossian coinage, reflect the «mixed types of self-identification» as both «Molossian» and «Epeirote» that were emerging at this time in Molossia.⁴⁷ This may well be true, but misses the significance of the fact that coins in the name of «the Apeirotēs» start to be minted at all. Coinage in the Classical Greek world was not produced to express identity (though it could come to do so), but to make payments and provide a medium of exchange. It was issued by a body with sufficient authority to guarantee its value and sufficient resources and organisation to carry out production. Such bodies could be non-state actors, such as the organisers of a festival.⁴⁸ However, more commonly, given that minting coins was generally a closely monitored and regulated activity, minting bodies are identifiable as the state or a king.⁴⁹ The coins in the name of «the Apeirotēs» bear an ethnic, not the name of a deity or the name of a king. This normally identifies a political community minting their own coinage.⁵⁰ Therefore, the best interpretation of the coins bearing the legend ΑΠΕΙΡΩΤΑΝ is that they show us there was a body called «the Apeirotēs» who possessed sufficient political identity and financial organisation to produce a fiduciary coinage in their name for local use in quotidian transactions.⁵¹

Two methodological points emerge from this analysis. Lists of theorodokoi can generally tell us names of political communities, but drawing any further political conclusions from them is very difficult due to the non-technical nature of their terminology. By contrast, the groups named on coins must be organised bodies in whose authority a user could trust to guarantee the coin's value. Getting these approaches to the evidence right is crucial for correctly rebuilding Molossian history.

In summary, coins show that «the Apeirotēs» were a real, formally constituted group lending their name to coinage from sometime before the death of Alexander I in 331/330. The Argive list of theorodokoi shows that there was a polity in north-west Greece ca. 334–324 called Apeiros, found roughly where Molossia was found earlier. Kleopatra the wife or widow of the Aiakid king Alexander I was appointed as theorodokos for Apeiros by this theoric delegation from Argos, as her uncle-in-law Tharyps II had been for Molossia in ca. 356–355 by theoroi from Epidauros. It is clear that, given the current state of the evidence, certainty for many aspects of Epeirote history is not achievable. But currently the best explanation for this evidence is that there was a state called Apeiros, inhabited by the Apeirotēs, and it had replaced Molossia as the state ruled by the Aiakid monarchy.

⁴⁷ MEYER 2013, 72–79, esp. 77; ead. 2015, 311.

⁴⁸ NIELSEN 2002, 142–152; THONEMANN 2011, 117–124; MEYER 2013, 75–77.

⁴⁹ MARTIN 1985, esp. 227–231.

⁵⁰ HANSEN – NIELSEN 2004, 144–149.

⁵¹ FUNKE 2000b, 110f. HAMMOND 1967, 543–546 thought bronze coinage in Molossia emerged to increase maritime trade. However, fiduciary coinage was used for every-day transactions, and is unlikely to have been linked to trade.

3. When and why did the Aiakids start leading *«Apeiros»* and not *«Molossia»*?

If we accept this, it is now necessary to find the most plausible historical context for the replacement of Molossia by Apeiros as the Aiakid state. The combination of the date ranges for the Argive list of theorodokoi (ca. 334–324) and the coinage of *«the Apeirotēs»* (before 331/330) indicate the reign of Alexander I (ca. 343/342–331/330) as the most probable date.

In 343/342, Philip II drove king Tharyps II from Molossia, replacing him with Alexander (I), brother to his wife Olympias. Philip handed over to Alexander three cities and a stretch of coastline on the Gulf of Ambrakia.⁵² For Philip II, this was sound policy.⁵³ He had pursued alliance with the Molossian kingdom since early in his reign when in 357 he married Olympias, a daughter of the former king Neoptolemos I and niece of Tharyps II.⁵⁴ A Molossian alliance promised greater security for the Upper Macedonian kingdoms from attack from north and west. Tharyps II had proven unreliable in his allegiance. Alexander had grown up at the Macedonian court as a hostage, and was said to have enjoyed an intimate relationship with Philip.⁵⁵ He would adhere to the Macedonian alliance more reliably than had his uncle.

As for Alexander I, his was a heady position. A young king with important connections, he had received an education at the Macedonian court which had emphasised competition and athletic and military skills.⁵⁶ He was backed by the strongest power on the Balkan peninsula and, thanks to Philip's gift, controlled substantially more territory than any previous Molossian king, including a valuable outlet to the sea.⁵⁷ More than anything else, he had grown up seeing from within the benefits that successful aggressive expansion under Philip II had brought to Macedonia. Inspired by the Macedonian experience of empire, Alexander I would prove hungry for conquest and glory himself.

Alexander I's ambitions are clear from his Italian campaign of 334–331/330,⁵⁸ and the link between his expansionist inclinations and his background at the Macedo-

⁵² Buchetion, Elatria, and Pandosia: Theop. FGrHist 115 F 206 and F 207; HAMMOND 1967, 534. [Dem.] 7 Hal. 32 records that they were given to Alexander «to be his slaves» (δουλεύειν): MEYER 2013, 61 n. 141. Pseudo-Skylax 32 (SHIPLEY 2011) records that the Molossians controlled 40 stades of coastline on the Gulf, and was probably writing after 343/342, contra HAMMOND 1967, 517.

⁵³ Philip and Epeiros: HAMMOND – GRIFFITH 1979, 504–509; HAMMOND 1994a, 120f.

⁵⁴ Plut. Alex. 2. 2; Curtius 8. 1. 26; Satyros ap. Ath. 13. 557c.

⁵⁵ Justin 8. 6. 5–6.

⁵⁶ MEYER 2013, 119. HAMMOND 1967, 539 on Macedonian/Molossian similarities.

⁵⁷ CABANES 1976, 113 argued for Molossian expansion westward into Thesprotia by the mid-fourth century, based on Xen. Hell. 6. 2. 10 where king Alketas in 373 transported 600 peltasts to Corcyra from the mainland at the Athenians' request. MEYER 2013, 61 notes that the ability to traverse a territory for a secret night crossing is not the same as controlling said territory.

⁵⁸ Livy 8. 24; Justin 12. 2. 1–15.

nian court has been made by MEYER.⁵⁹ But, in addition to the Italian expedition, we should be thinking of an expansionist programme at home. It is hardly credible that, between assuming the throne in 343/342 and departing for Italy in 334, Alexander I had not tried to build upon his initial strong position within Epeiros itself. MEYER suggests that Alexander spent these years constructing a series of alliances with his neighbours.⁶⁰ This is certainly plausible. But in addition, the evidence outlined above suggests the creation by Alexander of a new state named Apeiros. His use of a term which had formerly been used to describe the wider area seems to express a claim to a sovereignty extending over the entire region. This was an ambitious claim, but thanks to Philip's gift Alexander was at least the first Aiakid king whose subject territories extended significantly beyond Molossia. Besides, he would not be the only ruler in history to lay claim to a greater sovereignty than he had achieved as a declaration of aggressive intent.⁶¹

Though our knowledge of Alexander I's reign is thin, accepting this context for the emergence of «Apeiros» has several advantages. It is a better fit for this substantial political act than the date after Alexander's death which has been preferred by some scholars. Whatever the nature of the administrative or structural rearrangements that accompanied the creation of the Aiakid kingdom of Apeiros, this concrete political change must have required a certain amount of political manoeuvring to gain consent for this change from various parties within the territories. Though who exactly these parties might have been (the Molossians, certainly – but aristocrats? a citizenry-in-arms?) and what this manoeuvring might have looked like are lost to us, the reign of a dynamic king backed by Macedon is a better context for such developments than after the death of that king in Italy and the subsequent (probable) accession of his son Neoptolemos as a child-king. Alexander I's ambitions in the west are attributed by Justin to a rivalry he felt with Alexander the Great of Macedon.⁶² It makes sense that these two royal houses, closely linked at this time by Philip's marriage to Olympias, should have had a significant impact on each other's policies. It also makes sense that such dynamics should have manifested themselves earlier in Alexander I's reign as well; though in the case of Philip II, perhaps it was more in a spirit of wishing to impress a mentor, than the spirit of direct rivalry he was said to feel with Alexander the Great.

⁵⁹ MEYER 2013, 119. Philip II's upbringing at Thebes has been seen as formative in much the same way: Justin 6. 9. 7, 7. 5. 2; Plut. Pelop. 26. 5; HAMMOND 1997b.

⁶⁰ MEYER 2013, 58–60, 119f. HAMMOND 1967, 534f. pictured a Molossian-led regional alliance, based on his interpretation of IG IX² 1. 4, 1750, discussed below.

⁶¹ MEYER 2013, 60–64 on previous Aiakid/Molossian expansion. Alexander the Great was said to have claimed the lordship of Asia when he invaded Asia Minor in 334 (Arr. Anab. 1. 11. 7; Diod. Sic. 17. 17. 2; Justin 11. 5. 10), after Issus in 333 (Arr. Anab. 2. 14. 7–9, 25. 3), and to have been proclaimed «lord of Asia» after Gaugamela in 331 (Plut. Alex. 34. 1). At none of these times had he completed military subjugation of the Persian empire.

⁶² Justin 12. 2. 1–2.

The creation of this new kingdom of Apeiros did not obliterate the Molossians. «The Molossians», «the koinon of the Molossians», and «the ekklesia of the Molossians» appear in the epigraphic record in the third century granting honours such as citizenship and proxenia to foreigners.⁶³ Nothing about this is incompatible with a new Aiakid kingdom of Apeiros under Alexander I. The Molossians would simply have continued to exist as a constituent part of a greater state led by the Aiakids, and were able to independently undertake certain activities which were part of the social relations between Greek communities and which posed no threat to the power of the monarch.⁶⁴ A close parallel would be Macedonia, where «the koinon of the Macedonians» and «the Macedonians» make dedications at major sanctuaries, recognise the inviolability of Kyzikos in the last quarter of the third century, and appear alongside the Macedonian king in treaties.⁶⁵ The Macedonians had a formal existence as a separate body, and had the resources, organisation, and authority to undertake some independent actions. But real power to make major decisions within his subject territories always lay with the Macedonian king. We should envisage a similar model for the Molossians within Apeiros, which at its foundation under Alexander I consisted of the Molossians, the territories and peoples granted to him by Philip II, and then whatever else he could integrate through conquest. While retaining their local identities, the inhabitants of Alexander I's territories would also now be «Apeirotes»: no great cognitive leap for Alexander's subjects, given that the region had always been one of multiple nested tiers of political and social organisation.

4. *Molossians, Apeirotes, and Aiakid ideology*

As with the epigraphic and numismatic evidence for the existence of Apeiros, the state of the evidence precludes certainty regarding much of Alexander I's reign. But if we accept that early in his reign Alexander I formed a new state to signal his territorial ambitions and took over the previously geographical term Apeiros for it, we can solve several other source problems from this period more plausibly, particularly with regard to the problematic and late literary sources for the region in this period.

Plutarch's account of Pyrrhos' early years in his «Life of Pyrrhos» appears to mix and match Molossians and Epeirotes and Molossia and Epeiros, and has been thought to make no distinction between the two groups.⁶⁶ In relating how Aiakides, Pyrrhos' father, was driven out of the kingdom in 317 and baby Pyrrhos spirited away, Plutarch (2. 1) says «but factions arose among the Molossians [οἱ Μολοσσοί], and expelling

⁶³ MEYER 2013, 79–90.

⁶⁴ RAYNOR 2016, 247–249 on the multitude of ways in which Greek communities could interact with one another in spite of being constituent parts of larger monarchic states.

⁶⁵ HATZOPOULOS 1996, II nos. 32–35; I.Cret. II xii, 20 (treaty between Antigonos Doson and the Macedonians and Eleutherna); I.Cret. III iii, 1 (treaty between Antigonos Doson and the Macedonians and Hierapytna).

⁶⁶ FUNKE 2000b, 115 n. 44.

Aiakides they brought into power the sons of Neoptolemos». Pyrrhos was given refuge by the Illyrian leader Glaukias, who in 307 (3. 3) «after [Pyrrhos] had reached twelve years old, brought him back into Epeiros [εἰς τὴν Ἡπειρον] with an armed force and set him up as king [βασιλέα κατέστησεν]». In 302 Pyrrhos fled again when (4. 1) «the Molossians [οἱ Μολοττοί] again banded together, drove out his friends, plundered his property, and put themselves under Neoptolemos». ⁶⁷ After time in the courts of both Demetrios Poliorketes and Ptolemy I, in 297 Pyrrhos, on Ptolemy's orders, «was sent into Epeiros [εἰς Ἡπειρον] with money and an army to regain his kingdom [ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλείαν ἀποσταλῆναι]». Following this return, Plutarch says «it was customary for the kings, after sacrificing to Zeus Areios at Passaron, a place in Molossia, to exchange solemn oaths with the Epeirotes, the kings swearing to rule according to the laws, the Epeirotes to guard the kingdom according to the laws». ⁶⁸ Plutarch relates how Pyrrhos first ruled jointly with Neoptolemos, but that sometime later (5. 7), «[Pyrrhos] was aware that the chief men among the Epeirotes [τῶν Ἡπειρωτῶν τοὺς κρατίστους] were devoted to him and were eager to see him rid himself of Neoptolemos».

In Plutarch's account, in 317 and 302 Molossians drive out the king. However, when Pyrrhos returns, it is to «Epeiros». Both times, Plutarch uses the language of kingship and provides no additional qualification as to over who or what Pyrrhos will be king, implying kingship over «Epeiros». Following Pyrrhos' second return in 297, Pyrrhos performs a customary oath-swearing ritual with «the Epeirotes», not the Molossians, and the leading men among «the Epeirotes» support him against Neoptolemos. This seems inconsistent, and requires explanation. It seems unlikely that Plutarch has got horribly muddled, since he is thought to have used Proxenos, who, as author of «Epeirotika» and Pyrrhos' court historian, was doubtless well-informed. ⁶⁹ An explanation following the generally accepted narrative of Epeirote history, that Plutarch's account reflects the existence of the new state of Apeiros after ca. 330 and its replacement of both Molossia and Thesprotia, does not explain why Molossians are portrayed as the leading decision-makers in 317 and 302. MEYER's solution, that the kingdom is still Molossia and the Epeirotes are allied neighbouring populations, makes the oaths sworn at Passaron a matter of foreign policy in which the allies swore to help defend the Molossian kingdom. ⁷⁰ This sits uneasily with the «customary» nature of the ritual and its location in Passaron, a firmly Molossian site, rather than Dodona, where one would expect scenes of regional cooperation to take place. It also goes against the implied logic of the references to Pyrrhos' kingship over «Epeiros». If Pyrrhos' kingship

⁶⁷ On which Neoptolemos: MEYER 2013, 68 n. 176.

⁶⁸ 5. 2: Εἰώθεισαν οἱ βασιλεῖς ἐν Πασσαράωνι, χωρὶς τῆς Μολοττίδος, Ἀρείῳ Διὶ θύσαντες ὀρκωμοτεῖν τοῖς Ἡπειρώταις καὶ ὀρκίζειν, αὐτοὶ μὲν ἄρξειν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, ἐκείνους δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν διαφυλάξειν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους.

⁶⁹ FGrHist 703; CATALDI 1990.

⁷⁰ MEYER 2013, 59f.

is over only the Molossians, and he is going to (the region of) Epeiros to regain (the kingship of) the Molossians in 307 and 297, why does Plutarch not say so?

Accepting the model sketched above, of Alexander I creating an Apeiros of which the Molossians were part, suggests a third solution. The Aiakid house had trouble managing its relationship with the Molossians, still a large and influential group among their Apeirote subjects. This led to Aiakides being driven out by them in 317, and his son Pyrrhos suffering the same in 302. On Pyrrhos' final return in 297, he quickly won major support among the Apeirotes as a whole: the leading men of the kingdom supported him against Neoptolemos, and he was able to undertake a 'customary' oath-swearing ritual, perhaps a Molossian ceremony reimagined for Apeiros.⁷¹ But there are still problems. Where are the rest of the Apeirotes in 317 and 302? Perhaps the Molossians sufficiently dominated Apeirote political life in these years to oust kings on their own. But if so, why have the leading men of 'the Apeirotes' as a whole so quickly supplanted Molossian dominance by 297?

All attempts to take Plutarch's historical details at face value here leave problems. Yet Plutarch's reliability compared to other sources like Diodoros has been emphasised recently, following the idea that Plutarch is probably drawing on Proxenos who is (to quote MEYER) «more likely [than Diodoros' sources] to have gotten these internal matters straight».⁷² This is an odd defence of Proxenos to make, however. Scholarly consensus is that Proxenos was a court historian for Pyrrhos, and nobody would suggest that Kallisthenes was merely interested in getting the facts of Alexander the Great's campaign straight. Are there any indications that Plutarch, using Proxenos, has perhaps given us a version of Pyrrhos' early years that represents a not entirely truthful 'official history' of Pyrrhos' rise to power in Aiakid Apeiros? Can this help disentangle some of the contradictions?

There is, in fact, a consistent logic to Plutarch's account of Pyrrhos' early years: whenever things go wrong for Pyrrhos, Molossians are responsible, whereas whenever Pyrrhos is successful, he is returning to Epeiros or receiving support from Epeirotes. By singling out the Molossians as the impediment to Pyrrhos' success, the author portrays opposition to Pyrrhos as limited to a single group identifiably smaller than all Epeirotes. They also portray that group as acting unilaterally as though they were still the only Aiakid subjects. This was an anachronistic and inappropriate assumption of authority after they became only a constituent part of the larger Apeirote kingdom, and it is shown to sabotage Pyrrhos' success. When Pyrrhos does well, however, he and his followers are portrayed as moving towards a successful and united Epeirote future under the leadership of an Aiakid king. The effect is to make Pyrrhos' setbacks seem less significant, and to associate them with the time when the Aiakids ruled only

⁷¹ CATALDI 1990, who takes the ceremony as fully historical, sees it as a Molossian ceremony reimagined for an Epeirote state.

⁷² MEYER 2013, 70.

the Molossians. By contrast, his successes seem more impressive and tied to wider support among the Epeirotes.

Whence this narrative scheme? Proxenos, unlike Plutarch, had reason to associate Epeiros and the Epeirotes with a glorious Aiakid present and future, and the Molossians and Molossia with a less glorious Aiakid past. Portraying his master's early years in this way would have downplayed Pyrrhos' failures, shifted the blame onto a single group within the kingdom, and supported Aiakid rule over the new and larger Apeiros by associating Aiakid-Molossian relations with impediments but Aiakid-Epeirote relations with success. Plutarch was no mere copyist of his sources, but if such ideological work was encoded at the level of who did what, it could survive literary crafting.⁷³

It seems the best explanation for the apparently muddled account of Pyrrhos' early years is that Plutarch transmits aspects of an encomiastic account by Proxenos of Pyrrhos' reign, written to portray his master in a flattering light and give his setback-ridden rise to pre-eminence more momentum than it actually had. Fully and accurately explicating historical detail seems to have taken a back seat to crafting this favourable narrative for Pyrrhos. This association of Molossia and Molossians with the past, and Epeirotes and Epeiros with the present and future, may go back to royal ideology propagated by Alexander I. It might originate later, or with Proxenos himself. Whatever the origins of the contrast, by taking advantage of the associations which Aiakid imperial ideology had given certain terms, or by inventing those associations by using terms in a certain way, Proxenos could attempt to ensure that Pyrrhos' rise to power was remembered as he wished it to be.

This also fits with the portrayal of Epeiros, the Epeirotes, Molossia, and the Molossians in the rest of Plutarch's text. There the Molossians appear as part of Pyrrhos' alliance only in a Roman speech denigrating their power, and as a cavalry contingent in Pyrrhos' army during his Peloponnesian campaign.⁷⁴ Both times they are constituent elements of larger bodies. When Molossia is mentioned, it is only as a region within which are strong links to an Aiakid past. It is where Passaron is located by the author. In a passage where Pyrrhos is said to have received advice from other kings on how to prosecute his war with Demetrios Poliorketes, these kings urge Pyrrhos not to wait until Demetrios is strong enough to wage a decisive war for (10. 4) «the sanctuaries and tombs in Molossia». In contrast, «the Epeirotes» appear multiple times as the people whom Pyrrhos leads and rules. As discussed above, they are portrayed as the key group supporting Pyrrhos following his return. After Pyrrhos defeated Demetrios' general Pantauchos in single combat in 289, (7. 5) «the Epeirotes, roused by their king's victory and admiring his excellence», cut apart the retreating Macedonian phalanx. Later (10. 1), it is «the Epeirotes» who give him the moniker «The Eagle». Deciding to abandon a later campaign in Macedonia, Pyrrhos is portrayed (12. 7) leading

⁷³ More recent work on Plutarch (e.g. PELLING 2011) has moved away from a model of Plutarch as copyist of his sources to stress his own literary finesse.

⁷⁴ Plut. Pyrr. 19. 2, 30. 5.

«the Epeirotes and allied forces» [τῆς Ἡπειρωτικῆς καὶ συμμαχικῆς δυνάμεως] out of the region. When ambassadors from Tarentum ask for Pyrrhos to lead a campaign against the Romans in southern Italy, not only Pyrrhos but also (13. 6) «the Epeirotes» were eager. When Plutarch has Caius Fabricius criticise the defeated Roman general Laevinus following the battle of Herakleia in 280 (18. 1), he portrays Pyrrhos as leader of «the Epeirotes», and Laevinus as leader of «the Romans». Likewise, Epeiros, not Molossia, is consistently portrayed as Pyrrhos' home base. As discussed, this is where he is said to return during his early attempts to regain the throne. Several other passages portray Epeiros as the place Pyrrhos returns to following campaigns.⁷⁵ One specifies that Pyrrhos' «own people» over whom he «exercise[s] kingship» are to be found in Epeiros.⁷⁶ Therefore, throughout the text the role of the Molossians is minimised, and Molossia the land is tied to the past. In contrast, the Epeirotes are Pyrrhos' subjects who follow him on campaign, and Epeiros is the kingdom to which Pyrrhos returns. Even the opening sentence of the text establishes that Pyrrhos' kingship extends beyond Molossia, when Plutarch tells us (1. 1): «historians say that the first king of the Thesprotians and the Molossians [Θεσπρωτῶν καὶ Μολοσσῶν] after the flood was Phaethon, one of those who came into Epeiros with Pelasgos». Though the subsequent genealogy associates Pyrrhos with a different mythical lineage, from the beginning, Plutarch (again, probably following Proxenos) establishes the kingship to which Pyrrhos is heir as extending beyond Molossia.⁷⁷

Ultimately, a solely historical explanation cannot fully resolve the inconsistencies in Plutarch's account of Pyrrhos' early years. Instead, these inconsistencies seem to reflect a textual strategy in Plutarch, probably inherited from Proxenos and deriving ultimately from Aiakid imperial ideology, wherein Epeiros and the Epeirotes are associated with a successful present, while Molossia and the Molossians are associated with a less successful past.

These associations are perhaps present in other evidence from around this time. Following a victory over an army of Antigonos Gonatas in 274, Pyrrhos dedicated the best of the spoils at a temple of Athena Itonis in Thessaly.⁷⁸ Pausanias and Plutarch record the accompanying inscription:

⁷⁵ 21. 4, Romans encourage Pyrrhos to return to Epeiros, εἰς Ἡπειρον; 26. 2, Pyrrhos returns to Epeiros following his Italian and Sicilian campaigns, εἰς Ἡπειρον; 34. 6, Antigonos Gonatas sends Pyrrhos' son Helenos back to Epeiros, εἰς Ἡπειρον.

⁷⁶ 13. 1: Τότε δ' οὖν εἰς Ἡπειρον ἐκπεσόντι τῷ Πύρρῳ καὶ προεμένῳ Μακεδονίαν ἢ μὲν τύχη παρέιχε χρῆσθαι τοῖς παροῦσιν ἀπραγμόνως καὶ ζῆν ἐν εἰρήνῃ, βασιλεύοντα τῶν οἰκείων.

⁷⁷ The Thesprotian and Molossian kingships are linked elsewhere: Paus. 1. 11. 2, 2. 23. 6 has Kestrinos, son of Andromache and Helenos, settle Thesprotia with Epeirotes. Kestrinos therefore had the same mother as Molossos, son of Neoptolemos son of Achilles, the progenitor of the Molossian royal house. Theopompos FGrHist 115 F 355 has Olympias making this connection in the mid-fourth century.

⁷⁸ Pausanias locates this «between Pherai and Larisa», but has been thought to have meant the sanctuary at Philia: see GRANINGER 2011, 52–54 for discussion, bibliography and a defence of Pausanias.

Τοὺς θυρεοὺς ὁ Μολοσσὸς Ἴτωνίδι δῶρον Ἀθήνα
 Πύρρος ἀπὸ θρασέων ἐκρέμασεν Γαλατᾶν,
 πάντα τὸν Ἀντιγόνου καθελὼν στρατόν· οὐ μέγα θαῦμα·
 αἰχμηταὶ καὶ νῦν καὶ πάρος Αἰακίδαί.⁷⁹

«These shields, now suspended here as a gift to Athena Itonis, Pyrrhos the Molossian took from valiant Gauls, after defeating the entire army of Antigonos; which is no great wonder; for now, as well as in olden time, the Aiakidai are brave spearmen.» (trans. PERRIN)

Pyrrhos identifies himself as a Molossian, not as an Epeirote, and this may well reflect one of the primary ways in which Pyrrhos saw himself. But this epigram looks backward and stresses the antiquity of the Aiakid house, probably to recall the Aiakid ancestor Neoptolemos, son of Achilles, and thus emphasise the link between his house and Thessaly.⁸⁰ In this context, it made particular sense to use «Molossian», not «Epeirote» or anything else, with its associations with the past and its longer connection with the Aiakid house.⁸¹ A similar dynamic may be at work in the gift made to Zeus at Dodona of a plaque by Agathon, son of Echephylos and a Zakynthian, in the late fourth or early third century.⁸² The poetic inscription after line 4 reads:

Ἀγάθων Ἐχεφύλλου καὶ γενεά, πρόξενοι Μολοσσῶν καὶ συμμάχων ἐν τριάκοντα
 γενεαῖς ἐκ Τρωΐας, Κασσάνδρας γενεά, Ζακύνθιοι.

«Agathon, the son of Echephylos, and his offspring, proxenoi of the Molossians and their allies throughout thirty generations from Troy, the race of Kassandra, Zakynthians.» (trans. FRASER)

Here Agathon emphasises the common descent he and his line share with the Molossian royal house (and extends it to all the Molossians) from the brothers of Kassandra,

⁷⁹ Paus. 1. 13. 2–3; Plut. Pyrr. 26. 5; BRINGMANN – VON STEUBEN 1995, I 169f., no. 105.

⁸⁰ GRANINGER 2011, 53f. For the development of Aiakid genealogy: CROSS 1932, 100–102.

⁸¹ Emphasising a Molossian connection, not an Epeirote one, in Thessaly around this time perhaps made sense. An inscription (CABANES 1976, Ep. App. no. 3; MEYER 2013, 79–82) of the end of the fourth century/beginning of the third records «the Molossians» granting privileges to one Lagetas son of Lagetas, a Thessalian from Pherai. Another (CABANES 1976, Ep. App. no. 2; MEYER 2013, 82–86), originally dated to the fourth century but down-dated by MEYER to the mid-third, records the «koinon of the Molossians» granting privileges to one or two euergetai from Mondaia in Thessaly. If these inscriptions suggest good relations between the Thessalian aristocracy and the Molossians around this time, Pyrrhos might have wanted to stress his Molossian aspect in a Thessalian sanctuary in 274. However, these connections could have developed after Pyrrhos' own efforts to develop ties with Thessaly.

⁸² IG IX² 1. 4, 1750. For discussion: FRASER 2003; MEYER 2013, 73f. See also SEG L 543 and LIII 570.

Agathon and Helenos. Since, like Pyrrhos' Thessalian dedication, it references in poetic fashion the distant past, it again made sense to use «Molossian» and mobilise the term's associations with the past (though possibly this was not a choice, but merely technically accurate, as we do not know whether Molossian proxenoi became Apeirote proxenoi during the political changes in this period). Therefore, while in Plutarch's narrative Molossia and the Molossians are associated with the past in a generally negatively-tinged way, the same associations could be mobilised in more positive fashion by insider and outsider alike.

Other evidence, seemingly lacking in the sorts of terminological associations discussed above, shows that the state and population over which the Aiakids ruled at the end of the fourth century were commonly represented as Apeiros/Epeiros and Apeirotes/Epeirotes. FRANKE noted that Diodoros' narrative switches over to «Epeirote/Epeiros» rather than «Molossians/Molossia» around 340.⁸³ FRANKE argued that Diodoros switched sources from Ephoros to someone else, and the change in terminology reflects this and not political change. But this does not preclude Diodoros' sources being correct, and the terminology change fits with the timetable for the creation of Apeiros under Alexander I suggested above. Diodoros uses «Molossian» only once after this point, in his description of the forces arrayed against Antipatros in the Lamian War in 323, when he includes (18. 11. 1) «those of the Molossians who were subject to Aryptaïos», Diodoros' name for the Aiakid Arybbas II. Diodoros' phrasing and use of «Molossian» rather than «Epeirote» perhaps indicates that Arybbas led only a small force of Molossians against Antipatros. After this point, Diodoros is consistent in using «Epeirote» language. The king after Arybbas, Aiakides, is «the Epeirote» in the narrative for 317 (19. 11. 2). Later that year (19. 36. 2) he is «king of the Epeirotes» [τὸν Ἡπειρωτῶν βασιλέα] and leading an army of «the Epeirotes» when he is blocked from crossing the mountains to support Olympias in Macedonia. These Epeirotes are unhappy with his alignment to Macedonian policy: in a passage mentioned above, they rebel, and after returning home they vote to exile Aiakides and ally with Kassandros.⁸⁴ Kassandros then (19. 36. 5) receives «Epeiros» [τὴν Ἡπειρον] into his alliance. In 312 (19. 88. 1) «the Epeirotes» are said to have given the kingship to Alketas, then deserted him (19. 88. 4) when the Macedonian general Lykiskos gathered superior forces, leaving Alketas to take refuge in the «Epeirote» city Eurymenai [εἰς Εὐρυμενὰς πόλιν Ἡπειρωτικὴν]. Diodoros has this Alketas survive and rule (19. 89. 3) «the Epeirotes» for some time before they tired of his harsh rule and murdered him and two of

⁸³ FRANKE 1955, 49; MEYER 2013, 69 f.

⁸⁴ Diod. Sic. 19. 36. 4 (see p. 247). FUNKE 2000b, 110 thought this passage evidence of a full federal government, with references to the federal state's members (τὰς πατρίδας) and a decision of the assembly of the koinon (κοινῶ δόγματι). I follow MEYER 2013, 70–72 in thinking that this over-interprets Diodoros' language. Diodoros need be referring to no more than the troops going home and reaching a common decision, especially since there are no indications elsewhere in Diodoros that he conceives of the Epeirotes possessing such federal machinery of government at this time.

his sons. Diodoros even inappropriately calls Olympias' father Neoptolemos «king of the Epeirotes» [βασιλέως τῶν Ἠπειρωτῶν] in her obituary (19. 51. 6). At this point in the main narrative (316) «Epeirotes» is the appropriate term for the kingdom of the Aiakids for Diodoros, and he therefore uses it even in this backward-looking passage. Overall, Diodoros consistently presents Epeiros and the Epeirotes as a cohesive (though fickle) body at this time. Given that he was drawing upon a high quality source in Hieronymos of Kardia, Diodoros' narrative shows that, at least to an outside observer like Hieronymos, the kingdom of the Aiakids was called Epeiros and inhabited by Epeirotes in this period.⁸⁵

Epigraphic evidence points in the same direction. An inscribed bronze shield from Dodona, dated ca. 280, was dedicated by «King Pyrrhos, the Epeirotes, and the Tarantines».⁸⁶ An earlier inscription, dated by king Neoptolemos (II) son of Alexander (I) and therefore to one of his periods of sole reign ca. 317–312 or 302–297, is more complex.⁸⁷ In it, «οἱ σύμμαχοι τῶν Ἀπειρωτᾶν» grant *ateleia* (freedom from taxes) and *enteleia* (a tax status equivalent to inhabitants) «ἐν Ἀπειρωι» (in Apeiros) to one Kleomachos, an Atintanian. The granting group has been translated as «those of the Epeirotes who are allied» and seen as an alternative term for the Epeirote Symmarchy which, according to the commonly accepted position, existed ca. 330–232.⁸⁸ MEYER notes that this is an unnatural translation and prefers «the allies of the Apeirotes». It is unclear in MEYER's interpretation, however, who these allies were and why they should be able to grant financial privileges «in Apeiros», even if Apeiros is being used geographically (as MEYER suggests) and even if the kingdom was highly unstable at the time (as MEYER suggests and was probably true). Even if in this inscription Apeiros and the Apeirotes are the kingdom and its inhabitants founded by Alexander I, as argued above, it remains to find «allies» of this kingdom who had the ability to grant financial privileges within it. One possible candidate deserves consideration: Kassandros, ruler of Macedon. Diodoros, if faithfully replicating Diadoch-period terminology, shows that Apeiros was «in alliance» with Kassandros from 317, as discussed above. During the two date windows for this inscription (317–312, or 302–297), affairs in the region were dominated by the Macedonians under Kassandros.⁸⁹ This probably gave him the *de facto* power to grant such financial privileges in Apeiros. We know he did so in at least one other technically independent allied territory he controlled:

⁸⁵ Hieronymos as source: HAMMOND 1967, 559–562; HORNBLLOWER 1981; MEYER 2013, 70f. The case for Hieronymos as Diodoros' main source for the period after Alexander the Great's death is more problematic than is often assumed: GATTINONI 2008, xii–xviii. To my mind, he remains the best candidate.

⁸⁶ SGDI 1368; Syll.³ 392.

⁸⁷ SGDI 1336. Drawing and discussion: MEYER 2013, 67–69, fig. 8.

⁸⁸ HAMMOND 1967, 559–561; CABANES 1976, 150–185; GAUTHIER 1979, 122; MEYER 2013, 67.

⁸⁹ MEYER 2013, 122–126.

he granted one Chairephanes *ateleia* in Kassandreia ca. 306–298.⁹⁰ While using the phrase <οἱ σύμμαχοι τῶν Ἀπειρωτῶν> would be a way of disguising Kassandros' interference in Apeiros, perhaps it was prudent to do so in this fractious kingdom in a way that was not necessary in Kassandreia, a city close to the Macedonian heartland bearing his own name. This remains a peculiar inscription, but the identification of <the allies> with Kassandros at least makes them a powerful individual with whom Apeiros was allied, who had the power to grant such privileges in the kingdom, and who had done similarly in another subject territory. At the very least, the text offers no barrier to the existence of Apeiros as the Aiakid kingdom at this time.

The common thread for all this evidence is that the choice of terms used to refer to events and groups within the Aiakid kingdom after Alexander I's creation of Apeiros could be determined not by whatever was officially the case, but by what was most suitable to the context. Differences in political nomenclature in our sources for this area at this time should perhaps not be seen as always reflecting definite changes between mutually exclusive forms of political organisation, but rather as reflecting the range of representations of political and cultural associations available to Molossians, Apeirotes, and those interacting with them. Political terminology is, after all, always contested ground. This must have been even more the case in conditions of instability such as those that existed in the region after Alexander I's death. Appreciating such subtleties is only possible if we search carefully for patterns within our texts, even at moments of apparently substantial confusion, as such patterns are likely to reveal valuable perspectives.

5. Royal policy and ethnogenesis

However charged such terms and their associations were in the half century following Alexander I's death, it seems clear that a regional, Epeirote identity eventually did crystallise and have meaning to the population of the region. Without a significant sense of regional belonging, the creation of an Epeirote federal state after 232 with a formal inclusive regional structure would not have seemed a reasonable solution to the crisis of governance faced after the Aiakid line's extinction. We should be wary of how far back before this point we retroject the situation after 232. Even if the names of the groups involved are the same, stable terminology can conceal substantial disputes in meaning. If Alexander I did create the political unit of Apeiros, it did not have to quickly lead to a parallel process of ethnogenesis whereby being Apeirote became an identity with significant <political salience> (to borrow CATHERINE MORGAN's phrase)⁹¹ to anyone within the polity. The most important elements in MEYER's model for Epeirote ethnogenesis (intensified regional cooperation from the end of the

⁹⁰ VOKOTOPOULOU 1997; see also SEG XLVII 940. Kassandreia as technically independent and allied: HATZOPOULOS 1993, 578–584.

⁹¹ MORGAN 2003.

fourth century, and a period ca. 317–297 of regular Macedonian interference) remain the most plausible catalysts for the emergence of a regional identity, even if the smaller groupings of Molossian, Thesprotian, and Chaonian remained an important level of quotidian identification.

But, if the above reconstruction is sound, then in this region certain kinds of evidence that have been taken in other contexts to indicate a relatively advanced stage of group identity formation (the existence of a polity with a synonymous population, which produces coins bearing its ethnic) emerged as products not of discourses of identity but of royal policy. Furthermore, they would antedate MEYER's key catalysts for the formation of Epeirote identity by a number of decades. Granted, it seems unlikely that Alexander I's new Apeiros would have remained without the standard conceptual underpinnings of group belonging for long. Our fragments of the early third century «Epeirotika» by Proxenos, all concerned with the descendants of Achilles, suggest that this work supplied the still relatively new community with a genealogical structure and mythic history to underpin its existence.⁹² As court historian to Pyrrhos, Proxenos may well have produced an official Aiakid mythology for Apeiros, formalised under Pyrrhos but with roots under Alexander I. It is interesting here to think of the Zakynthian inscription considered above, which included all the Molossians in what seems before this to have been an exclusively Aiakid line of descent.⁹³ Why this change? Was this an offshoot of Aiakid ideology for Apeiros that justified a continued dominance of Molossians in the new polity through the extension of a privileged line of descent? Or a defensive response which upgraded Molossian genealogy, originating in anxiety over the erosion of Molossian prestige following the renaming of their kingdom? Or did some combination of these and other pressures produce a discourse which combined the concerns of both rulers and the multiple communities they ruled? This latter suggestion seems most plausible: Proxenos' mythologies are unlikely to have been made out of whole cloth, however recently local traditions for him to draw on had developed.

Nevertheless, it remains important to stress that the early definition of Apeiros and the Apeirotes as a political community united under Aiakid rule by Alexander I may well have contributed at least as much to the formation of a regional Epeirote identity as the longer-term processes involving collaboration and interchange which occurred naturally between regional population groups. Though chronological precision is impossible, this factor of royal policy possibly significantly antedated, and acted as an important catalyst for, the intensification of such longer-term processes to the point where they could result in ethnogenesis. It may well have provided the rationale for a more inclusive regional identity, and an already politicised set of terms to which to

⁹² FGrHist 703 F 1–3. MORGAN 2003, 8 observed that the third century quasi-historical works on various ethne fitted a contemporary fashion for «heroizing» local histories. The «Epeirotika» probably fitted this mould.

⁹³ CROSS 1932, 102.

attach said identity. At the very least, the probable origin in the expansionist claims of Alexander I of «Apeiros» and «the Apeirotes» as political terms seems to have allowed contemporaries some choice in how they represented political and social associations in the area. The traces of these choices which survive in our sources look rather confused after more than two thousand years. But they allow us tantalising glimpses into how various actors tried to deal with, justify, and take advantage of the creation of a kingdom called Apeiros in an already full physical and conceptual landscape.

What we are ultimately brought back to is power. NICHOLAS PURCELL has proposed that changes in the layout of ancient cities should be conceived of not in evolutionist, organic terms, but as interventions by the powerful to change the urban fabric according to their own goals.⁹⁴ A similar point could be made for the changes in the political structure of Epeiros in the late fourth/early third centuries. Philip II's successes leading Macedon increased the power and prestige of those connected with him, and the viability and visibility of charismatic one-man rule as a mode of government. Alexander I and the Aiakids who followed him had unprecedented ability to reshape the political geography of the region. It seems probable that any study of the monarchical states of the north Balkans from the mid-fourth century onwards which draws models for political change from the world of the polis, where political power was usually more horizontally diffused, will remain incomplete without making a lot of room for the influence of the king.

Diodoros' use of the language of alliance in books 16–20 of the Library of History

A word search of Diodoros' text for «συνμαχ» was done using Thesaurus Linguae Graecae© Digital Library. Ed. Maria C. Pantelia. University of California, Irvine. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu> (accessed Mar. 23, 2017). 716 results were retrieved. 210 were from books 16–20. They are divided below according to whether the term is used with reference to (A) one or more political communities, (B) one or more contingent of allied soldiers in a military context, or (C) one or more individuals (generally kings, dynasts, or army leaders), or a combination of these. These are the only meanings found in these books: in Diodoros' narrative for the second half of the fourth century, alliance is something arranged between states, between powerful individuals, or between states and powerful individuals, and/or something demonstrated by fighting together.

(A) XVI. 1. 5, 7. 3, 8. 3, 8. 4, 9. 2, 21. 1, 22. 2, 27. 4, 27. 5, 32. 2, 32. 3, 33. 2 (2 uses), 33. 3, 37. 2, 37. 4, 39. 4, 63. 1, 67. 1, 69. 8, 73. 4, 78. 1, 82. 4, 85. 1, 85. 3; XVII. 8. 5, 9. 1, 34. 8, 113. 1; XVIII. 7. 4; 10. 5, 11. 1 (2 uses), 11. 2 (2 uses), 12. 3, 17. 8, 18. 1, 19. 5, 20. 3, 20. 7, 41. 1, 55. 3, 69. 3; XIX. 4. 3, 62. 9 (2 uses), 65. 6, 65. 7, 66. 6, 70. 2, 72. 3, 73. 2, 73. 4, 76. 1, 76. 5, 77. 3, 89. 2, 101. 2; XX. 3. 3, 10. 5, 18. 3, 35. 2, 38. 2, 56. 3, 59. 3, 59. 4, 71. 1, 80. 1, 89. 5, 90. 2, 90. 4, 101. 5.

(B) XVI. 7. 3, 21. 3, 30. 4, 34. 1, 35. 1, 36. 4, 39. 3, 39. 6, 44. 1, 44. 4, 46. 4, 54. 1, 57. 1, 62. 4, 67. 4, 74. 4, 77. 2, 78. 2, 80. 2, 85. 5; XVII. 17. 3, 63. 2, 63. 3, 64. 6, 74. 3, 95. 4; XVIII. 7. 5, 7. 6, 12. 4, 17. 6, 45. 1, 68. 3, 70. 4; XIX. 4. 7, 22. 2, 29. 3, 38. 1, 39. 1, 72. 2, 106. 5; XX. 17. 4, 29. 6, 61. 1, 61. 6, 82. 4.

(C) XVI. 14. 2, 41. 3, 42. 6, 91. 4; XVII. 25. 6, 86. 7, 87. 2, 90. 4; XVIII. 29. 6, 50. 4, 52. 4, 54. 3, 55. 2, 57. 2, 59. 1, 62. 2, 62. 5, 64. 3, 64. 4; XX. 17. 1, 19. 2, 105. 1.

⁹⁴ PURCELL 2005.

- (A) + (B) XVI. 21. 1, 21. 2, 32. 4, 36. 1, 39. 1, 39. 5, 63. 1, 66. 6, 80. 6, 89. 3; XVII. 22. 5, 63. 1; XVIII. 20. 4, 21. 4, 46. 2, 74. 3; XIX. 106. 5; XX. 22. 4, 88. 9.
- (A) + (C) XVI. 59. 2, 69. 8, 71. 2, 84. 5 (4 uses), 85. 5, 87. 3; XVII. 14. 2, 49. 3, 111. 3; XVIII. 46. 1 (2 uses), 49. 3 (2 uses), 52. 3, 75. 2 (2 uses); XIX. 35. 1, 36. 1, 36. 4, 36. 5 (2 uses), 54. 3, 57. 3, 60. 3, 67. 3, 67. 7, 68. 2, 72. 1, 75. 6, 77. 6, 77. 7, 78. 3, 78. 4, 90. 2; XX. 3. 2, 40. 5, 42. 3, 46. 1, 46. 5, 55. 5, 82. 1, 99. 3, 100. 6, 108. 3.
- (B) + (C) XVI. 22. 1, 34. 1; XVIII. 14. 4; XIX. 58. 5.

Darwin College
University of Cambridge
bdr25@cam.ac.uk

Bibliography

- BECK, H. 2003. New Approaches to Federalism in Ancient Greece. Perceptions and Perspectives. In K. BURASELIS – K. ZOUMBOULAKIS (eds.) *The Idea of European Community in History. Conference Proceedings II. Aspects of connecting poleis and ethne in Ancient Greece*, 177–190.
- BECK, H. – FUNKE, P. (eds.) 2015. *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*.
- BERNARDELLI, A. 2001. Un probabile ripostiglio di monete greche al Museo Civico di Vicenza (Sec. III–II A. C.). In A. SACCOCCI (ed.) *Inspecto Nummo: scritti di numismatica, medagliistica e sfragistica offerti dagli allievi a Giovanni Gorini*, 3–22.
- BERVE, H. 1926. *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*.
- BRINGMANN, K. – VON STEUBEN, H. 1995. *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer 1. Zeugnisse und Kommentare*.
- CABANES, P. 1969. À Propos de la liste argienne de théarodoques. REG 82, 550f.
 – 1976. L'Épire de la mort de Pyrrhos à la conquête Romaine.
 – 1981. Les États fédéraux de Grèce du nord-ouest: pouvoirs locaux et pouvoir fédéral. In H. J. WOLFF – A. BISCARDI – J. MODRZEJEWSKI (eds.) *Symposion 1979. Actes du IV^e Colloque International de droit Grec et Hellénistique, Egine 3–7 septembre 1979*, 99–111.
 – 1988. Les Concours des Naia de Dodone. Nikephoros 1, 49–84.
 – 1997. Political Institutions. In M. B. SAKELLARIOU (ed.) *Epirus. 4000 Years of Greek History and Civilization, Greek Lands in History*, 81–89.
 – 2004. L'Épire et le royaume des Molosses à l'époque d'Alexandre le Molosse. In *Alessandro il Molosso e i «condottieri» in Magna Grecia I: atti del quarantatreesimo Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Grecia: Taranto – Cosenza 26–30 settembre 2003*, 11–52.
- CARNEY, E. 2000. *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia*.
- CATALDI, S. 1990. Il giuramento al popolo dei re molossi. In G. NENCI – G. THÜR (eds.) *Symposion 1988. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Siena – Pisa, 6.–8. Juni 1988)*, 179–192.
- CHARNEUX, P. 1966a. Liste argienne de théarodoques. BCH 90, 156–239.
 – 1966b. Premières remarques sur la liste argienne de théarodoques. BCH 90, 710–714.
- CROSS, G. N. 1932. *Epirus. A Study in Greek constitutional development*.
- DAKARIS, S. I. 1971. *Archaeological Guide to Dodona*.
 – 1989. *Κασώπη. Νεότερες ανασκαφές 1977–1983*.
- D'ALESSANDRO, A. 2015. Review of MEYER, E. A. 2013. *The Inscriptions of Dodona and a New History of Molossia*. Klio 97.2, 763–771.
- DAUX, G. 1971. Sur quelques inscriptions (anthroponymes, concours à Pergame, serment éphébique). REG 84, 350–383.

- DAVIES, J. K. 2000. A Wholly non-Aristotelian Universe: The Molossians as Ethnos, State, and Monarchy. In R. BROCK – S. HODKINSON (eds.) *Alternatives to Athens. Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece*, 234–258.
- DIETERLE, M. 2007. Dodona: religionsgeschichtliche und historische Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung des Zeus-Heiligtums.
- FINLEY, M. I. 1963. *The Ancient Greeks*.
- FRANKE, P. R. 1955. *Alt-Epirus und das Königtum der Molosser*.
– 1961. *Die Antiken Münzen von Epirus*.
- FRASER, P. M. 2003. Agathon and Kassandra (IG IX.I² 4.1750). *JHS* 123, 26–40.
– 2009. *Greek Ethnic Terminology*.
- FUNKE, S. 2000a. Aiakidenmythos und epeirotisches Königtum. *Der Weg einer hellenistischen Monarchie*.
– 2000b. ΑΠΕΙΡΟΣ 317–272 BC: the Struggle of the Diadochi and the Political Structure of the Federation. In L. MOOREN (ed.) *Politics, Administration and Society in the Hellenistic and Roman World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Bertinoro 19–24 July 1997*, 107–121.
- FUNKE, P. – MOUSTAKIS, N. – HOCHSCHULZ, B. 2004. Epeiros. In M. H. HANSEN – T. H. NIELSEN (eds.) *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis*, 338–350.
- GATTINONI, L. 2008. *Diodoro Siculo, Biblioteca Storica, Libro XVIII. Commento Storico*.
- GAUTHIER, P. 1979. Sur les institutions de l'Épire hellénistique. *RPh* 53, 120–128.
- GIOVANNINI, A. 1977. Le statut des cités de Macédoine sous les Antigonides. In *Ancient Macedonia 2: Papers read at the Second International Symposium held in Thessaloniki, 19–24 August, 1973*, 465–472.
- GJONGEČAJ, S. 2007. Le trésor de Lleshan (Elbasan). *RN* 163, 101–140, pls. xv–xxxviii.
- GJONGEČAJ, S. – PICARD, O. 2005. Le trésor de Senitsa et le monnayage des Chaones en Épire. *RN* 161, 51–58, pl. x.
- GRANINGER, D. 2011. *Cult and Koinon in Hellenistic Thessaly*.
- HALL, J. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*.
– 2002. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L. 1967. *Epirus. The geography, the ancient remains, the history and topography of Epirus and adjacent areas*.
– 1980a. The Hosts of Sacred Envoys Travelling Through Epirus. *Epeirotika Chronika* 22, 9–20.
– 1980b. Some Passages in Arrian Concerning Alexander. *CQ* 30, 455–476.
– 1994a. Philip of Macedon.
– 1994b. Illyrians and Northwest Greeks. In *Cambridge Ancient History VI². The Fourth Century BC*, 422–443.
– 1997a. The Entry of Epirus into the Greek World (400–330 B.C.). In M. B. SAKELLARIOU (ed.) *Epirus. 4000 Years of Greek History and Civilization, Greek Lands in History*, 59–62.
– 1997b. What May Philip Have Learnt as a Hostage in Thebes? *GRBS* 38.4, 355–372.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L. – GRIFFITH, G. T. 1979. *A History of Macedonia II. 550–336 B.C.*
- HANSEN, M. H. – NIELSEN, T. H. (eds.) 2004. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*.
- HATZOPOULOS, M. B. 1993. Le statut de Cassandree à l'époque hellénistique. *Ancient Macedonia 5: Papers read at the Fifth International Symposium held in Thessaloniki, October 10–15, 1989*, 575–584.
– 1996. *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, 2 vols.
– 2006. *La Macédoine. Géographie historique, langue, cultes et croyance, institutions*.
- HECKEL, W. 2006. *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander the Great*.
- HORNBLOWER, J. 1981. *Hieronymus of Cardia*.
- LE RIDER, G. 2003. *Alexandre le Grand: Monnaie, finances, et politique*.

- LEMMO, V. 2012. Il ripostiglio di Lizzano (IGCH 1926), dalla scoperta alla dispersione. *RIN* 113, 203–246.
- LÉVÊQUE, P. 1957. Pyrrhos.
– 1997. The Reign of Pyrrhos. In M. B. SAKELLARIOU (ed.) *Epirus. 4000 Years of Greek History and Civilization, Greek Lands in History*, 74–79.
- LURAGHI, N. 2008. The Ancient Messenians: Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory.
- MACK, W. 2015. Proxeny and Polis. *Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World*.
- MARTIN, T. R. 1985. Sovereignty and Coinage in Classical Greece.
- MCINERNEY, J. 2001. Ethnos and ethnicity in early Greece. In I. MALKIN (ed.) *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, 51–73.
- MEYER, E. A. 2013. The Inscriptions of Dodona and a New History of Molossia.
– 2015. Molossia and Epeiros. In H. BECK and P. FUNKE (eds.) *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, 297–318.
- MILLER, S. G. 1988. The Theorodokoi of the Nemean Games. *Hesperia* 57, 147–163.
- MORGAN, C. 2003. Early Greek States Beyond the Polis.
- MOUSTAKIS, N. 2006. Heiligtümer als politische Zentren. *Untersuchungen zu den multidimensionalen Wirkungsgebieten von polisübergreifenden Heiligtümern im antiken Epirus*.
- NIELSEN, T. H. 2002. Arkadia and its Poleis in the Archaic and Classical Periods.
- OIKONOMIDOU-KARAMESINI, M. 1984. Χάλκινο νόμισμα των Ηπειρωτών από τις ανασκαφές της αρχαίας Κασσώπης. *Epeirōtika Chronika* 26, 39–42.
- ΠΑΡΑΖΟΓΛΟΥ, F. 1983. Sur l'organisation de la Macédoine sous les Antigonides. In *Ancient Macedonia 3: Papers read at the Third International Symposium held in Thessaloniki, Sept. 21–25, 1977*, 195–210.
- PELLING, C. 2011. *Plutarch and History. Eighteen Studies*.
- PERLMAN, P. 2000. City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece. The Theorodokia in the Peloponnese.
- PERRIN, B. 1959. *Plutarch's Lives IX: Demetrius and Antony, Pyrrhus and Caius Marius*.
- PICARD, O. – GJONGEČAJ, S. 2001. Apollonia et le monnayage épirote: le trésor de Bakërr. *RN* 157, 223–249.
- PICCININI, J. 2015. Past and Present Scholarship on the Politeia of the Epirotes and a New Book on the History of Molossia. *L'Antiquité Classique* 84, 173–181.
- PURCELL, N. 2005. Statics and Dynamics: Ancient Mediterranean Urbanism. In R. OSBORNE – B. CUNLIFFE (eds.) *Mediterranean Urbanization 800–600 BC*, 249–272.
- RAYNOR, B. 2016. Theorodokoi, Asyilia, and the Macedonian Cities. *GRBS* 56, 225–262.
- RHODES, P. J. – OSBORNE, R. 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404–323 BC*.
- RUTHERFORD, I. 2013. *State Pilgrims and Sacred Observers in Ancient Greece*.
- SHIPLEY, G. 2011. *Pseudo-Skylax's Periplus: The Circumnavigation of the Inhabited World. Text, Translation, and Commentary*.
- THONEMANN, P. 2011. *The Maeander Valley: a Historical Geography from Antiquity to Byzantium*.
- TOURATSOGLU, J. P. 1993. *The Coin Circulation in Ancient Macedonia (ca. 200 B.C.–286 A.D.)*.
- VOKOTOPOULOU, I. 1997. Ο Κάσσανδρος, η Κασσάνδρεια και η Θεσσαλονίκη. In P. ADAM-VELENI – M. APOSTOULOU – V. ALLAMANI-SOURI (eds.) *Μνήμη Μανόλη Ανδρόνικου*, 39–50.
- VOUTIRAS, E. 2004. La Macedonia e l'Epiro in un periodo di transizione: la seconda metà del quarto secolo. In *Alessandro il Molosso e i «condottieri» in Magna Grecia: atti del quarantatreesimo Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia: Taranto – Cosenza 26–30 settembre 2003*, 217–242.
- WHITEHEAD, D. 1996. Polis-Toponyms as Personal Entities (in Thucydides and Elsewhere). *MusHelv* 53, 1–11.