

title *vir perfectissimus* is Claudius Iulianus, prefect in AD 201 (no. 28). The summary is followed by another table containing a comparison between the “fasti” of the prefects of Pavis D’Ecurac and the author (p. 121–124), a bibliography and copious indexes.

If I may mention some details that struck me as dubious or incorrect, I would like to observe that I find it hard to believe that L. Iulius Vehilius Gr[at]us Iulianus (no. 26) could or should be identified with persons called simply “Iulius Iulianus”. On p. 1, Caldelli seems to misunderstand K. Wachtel in *PIR*² T 410, for Wachtel, unlike D. Faoro, very clearly advocates the identification of the two Turranii. “Pflaum 1980” (p. 46) and “Carboni 2017” are not in the bibliography, and there are also some spelling errors (e.g. Hans-George instead of Hans-Georg, p. 1; “Wirtschaftsgesetzbung” instead of -gebung, p. 2; *praefctus*, p. 35, etc.). But these are minor matters in a book which is both useful and accessible.

Olli Salomies
University of Helsinki

DIEGO CHAPINAL-HERAS: *Experiencing Dodona: The Development of the Epirote Sanctuary from Archaic to Hellenistic Times*. De Gruyter, Berlin – Boston 2021. ISBN 978-3-11-072751-7; ISBN (e-book) 978-3-11-072759-3. XII, 264 pp. EUR 113.95.

During antiquity the sanctuary of Zeus at Dodona, especially famous for its oracle, was one of the most important in the Greek world. Although the site has been excavated since the 1870s, it remains poorly published compared with, for instance, Delphi or Olympia. The last decades have seen a growing interest in Dodona and Epirus in general, leading to a steady stream of new publications, the most important concerning the sanctuary being the corpus of all known oracular tablets that appeared in 2013. The most recent addition to the growing number of publications on Dodona is Diego Chapinal-Heras’ (DCH) monograph, which is an English translation of his Spanish dissertation from 2017.

Apart from describing the sanctuary, its evolution and main features, DCH also seeks to elucidate its relationship with the surrounding Molossian, Epirote and Hellenic worlds. It is not his intent to produce a new guide book of the sanctuary per se, nor to focus on its religious importance, but rather “to offer a broad insight of Dodona as a scene for cult, political, economic, social and cultural matters.” The book consists of eight chapters dealing with different topics such as the evolution of the sanctuary from the Archaic period until 167 BC, various religious aspects, routes, communications and geographical contexts, pilgrimage and finally the multi-functional character of the site.

The broad approach taken by DCH is new and laudable, although at the same time problematic as it forces the author to generalise instead of focusing in more detail on fewer aspects. Accordingly, he seldom gets above synthesising and discussing previous research. He has fully mastered the recent research literature on Dodona, but is less well read on questions dealing with routes, communications and geographical contexts. More worrisome is his inconsistent and rather cursory reading of sources and literature that occasionally leads to misinterpretations. I will here highlight a few.

An important turning point in the development of Dodona took place at some stage during the late fifth or the first half of the fourth century BC, when the administration of the sanctuary was taken over by the Molossians from the Thesprotians, in whose sphere of influence it had been before. The emergence of the Epirote Alliance ca 330/328 BC is another major change that greatly affected the evolution of the site. DCH wants to see the monumentalisation of the sanctuary in the context of these changes, which seems plausible. However, his suggestion that the level of monumentalisation, with the exception of the theatre, would have been deliberately kept low due to a decision to preserve the natural environment of the site (pp. 42, 202, 224) makes little sense. The sacred buildings of Dodona reflect rather the typical architecture of such buildings in Epirus, which are characterised by their small size.

When describing the routes connecting Dodona with other parts of Epirus, Illyria, Thessalia and Ambrakia to the south, DCH relies heavily on Nicolas Hammond's seminal work. At the same time, he also discusses the main sites of Molossia and Epirus "that had a major influence on the development of Dodona and its routes". The only route described by him as leading from the Ionian coast to Dodona is the one beginning at Nekomanteion, following the course of the Acheron inland. As a result, and with the exception of Nekomanteion, he totally excludes all of Thesprotia from his discussion, which is strange if one takes into account that the sanctuary for centuries belonged to Thesprotia. The shortest route from Dodona westwards leads to Paramythia and from there onwards towards the coast (N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus: The Geography, the Ancient Remains, the History and the Topography of Epirus and Adjacent Areas*, Oxford 1967, pp. 34, 166). DCH only mentions this *en passant* while describing the geographical setting of Dodona, when he states that the Tsaracovitsa valley (where Dodona is located) "merges into Souli and Paramythia valleys" (p. 12).

DCH states that he has used ArcGIS in preparing his account of the routes to Dodona, having taken into account "the energy required for movement" (p. XI). However, the reader is never informed about the details of his calculations, nor to what extent his results depend on the fact that he seems to assume that places like Delphi and Dodona could only be reached on foot (p. 224). Would he have come to different conclusions if he had made his calculations assuming that the

travellers/pilgrims journeyed by cart or by horse or donkey? Hammond (1967, p. 166), for instance, rode in only eight hours from Paramythia to Dodona, whereas he described the route along the Acheron as “difficult to access”, passing through a “wild and remote area” (Hammond 1967, pp. 161–166).

Special emphasis is understandably put on the region of Molossia, the main settlements and other smaller sanctuaries of which are discussed in relation to Dodona. This treatment is hampered by the fact that DCH, based on a short reference in Hammond’s monograph on Epirus (1967, p. 185), seems to believe that Lake Pamvotis did not exist during the Classical and Hellenistic periods (pp. 11, 142). According to him, Georgia Pliakou in her doctoral dissertation (*Το λεκανοπέδιο των Ιωαννίνων και η ευρύτερη περιοχή της Μολοσσίας στην κεντρική Ήπειρο: αρχαιολογικά κατάλοιπα, οικιστική οργάνωση και οικονομία*, unpubl. PhD diss., University of Thessaloniki 2007) supports this, stating that the Ioannina plain did not then have the lake of today, “but rather was a marshy region”. This quotation is in error: Pliakou nowhere in her dissertation denies the existence of the lake, whose limnological and palynological development is nowadays well researched.

Due to inconsistency, DCH sometimes also contradicts himself. Thus, he states early on that the earliest walls of the main Molossian sites date to the first half of the third century BC and that the fortified sites Kastritsa and Megalo Gardiki “were far larger than Dodona, which covered 5–10 ha” (p. 15). Later on, however, he maintains that the fortification of Dodona covered 3.5 ha and should be dated to the second half of the fourth century BC (p. 46), whereas the walls of Megalo Gardiki belong to “the last decades of the fourth or the beginning of the third century BC” (p. 148). DCH rejects Pliakou’s recent suggestion to identify Passaron with the castle of Ioannina and prefers to place this most important Molossian town at Megalo Gardiki, “given the size and features of this ... site, one of the largest in the Molossian territory”. However, Megalo Gardiki is in reality, despite its name, only a medium-sized acropolis covering 8.95 ha, being close in size to Dodona (3.5 ha) or Ammotopos/Orraon (5.5 ha), and is clearly much smaller than Kastritsa (34.5 ha) or the castle of Ioannina (the exact size of which during antiquity cannot be estimated).

The plundering of Epirus by L. Aemilius Paullus in 167 BC can be mentioned as another example of contradictory statements and cursory and inconsistent use of sources and research literature. On p. 85, DCH writes with reference to it: “when Rome conquered [sic] Epirus, the Molossians alone were punished for their support of Perseus of Macedonia (Plut. *Aem.* 29), since the Thesprotians and Chaonians had contributed troops to the Roman army (Liv. 43.23)”, although Plutarch nowhere maintains that only the Molossians would have been so targeted. On p. 99 the same story is told differently: “Those who had supported the Macedonians were punished. Among these were some areas of Epirus, especially Molossia and southern Thesprotia,” followed by: “Over decades scholars have attempted to identify evidence of damage or population

decrease in Epirote settlements, but recent investigations suggest that these conclusions may be wrong and that signs of damage in some settlements might belong to the Aetolian attack in 219.” In support of the latter statement, DCH refers to Bowden in *Thesprotia Expedition I* (2009, p. 167), although no mention of the Aetolians can be found there. Probably DCH took this statement from Turmo in *Thesprotia Expedition II* (2011, p. 198): but in that case however he has totally ignored the new evidence for the magnitude of the damage caused in 167 BC brought forward in that same volume (pp. 15–21).

The description of the geographical context is occasionally marred by smaller false statements due to a careless use of the literature. On p. 24, the important Dark Age site of Mavromandilia is said to be located “near Dodona”, although in reality it is to be found in the Kokytos valley ca. 23 km to the southwest of the sanctuary. DCH’s description of the geographical setting of Dodona in the Tsaracovitsa valley (p. 12) could be mentioned as another example, where referencing Hammond (1967, p. 9) he states that “One of the highest points in this area is Korillas (Paramythia), 1,658 m above sea level, which has a sanctuary near the slopes of mount Ptomaros (Olitsika)”. However, Mount Gorilla next to Paramythia is actually located more than 20 km west of Dodona, whereas Mount Tomaros (Olytsika), which constitutes the southern border of the Tsaracovitsa valley, rises to the imposing height of 1,974 m above sea level (as also noted by Hammond 1967, p. 10).

This book would definitely have gained from being more thoroughly proofread. This goes not only for the content but also for the language that needed a final polishing. Some of the mistakes could even have been avoided by using a language/grammar check program (does De Gruyter not use such technology?). It would not have been difficult to find and avoid mistakes or misspellings like: eucaution (p. XI), Bizantine times (p. 4), emphsais (p. 17), epigraps (p. 39), Illiad (pp. 42, 66), inscription, nervetheless (p. 57), Lucius Emilius Paulus, de res rustica (p. 99), Sicyion (p. 127), Crasus (p. 141), “in 31st BCE Nicopolis was founded [sic]” (p. 221) or Dydimia (p. 225).

DCH in his dissertation has applied a new approach to Dodona, based on the sanctuary’s relationship with its surroundings and historical background, aiming to analyse the multi-functionality of the site not only as a religious, but also as a political, economic and socio-cultural centre. This is positive. Unfortunately, the work suffers from having been too hastily written and badly proofread. Higher-quality maps and illustrations would have raised the quality of the book – and thereby justified the high price that De Gruyter asks for it.

Björn Forsén
University of Helsinki