have been more careful, because here of all parts (in the bibliography) quite a number of (not only typographical) errors have been overlooked.¹

Bochum

Raphaël Dammer


Classical Elis had, by Greek standards, a very large territory, including the sanctuary at Olympia, and in addition established intermittent domination over a farther large area occupied by neighbours in the western Peloponnese. A sizeable academic literature has developed on its history, and on related archaeological, epigraphic, and numismatic questions, but works of synthesis have been few, and that of Ruggeri (R.) is welcome. Such a work however faces the problem that evidence is patchy, and R.’s response is to concentrate on a period defined by two of the episodes for which we have somewhat better evidence: the Spartan-Elean war of c. 400 at one end and at the other the Peloponnesian conflicts that broke out in the aftermath of the battle of Leuktra in 371 and continued until the battle of Mantinea in 362.

By the end of the fifth century Elis had established control of the entire area of the western Peloponnese that was bounded by Achaia to the north, Arkadia to the east, and Messenia to the south: some of this area was made up of Elean territory proper, and the rest of a number of communities bound to Elis as subordinate allies and commonly referred to in modern scholarship as perioikoi of Elis. At the end of the Spartan-Elean war (for which R. accepts the date 400, while recognising that it is disputed) Sparta compelled Elis to free all the perioikoi, and there followed a period in which Elis tried, with limited success, to recover control of its lost allies, while they in their turn reacted in various ways to the recovery of freedom and to the political vicissitudes of the time. The developments of this period both in Elis itself and among the perioikoi form the subject of R.’s book.

Her work, an adaptation of a Vienna dissertation, is meticulously organised. A first section deals with Elis itself, and a second with the various perioikic communities in turn (Triphylia, Akroreia, Lasion, the three communities of Letrinoi, Amphidoloi, and Marganeis, and finally Pisatis). The book closes with a concluding chapter drawing together main themes from the earlier sections. The main sections are subdivided into relatively brief numbered subsections so that the argument, both in detail and in its overall development, is presented with great clarity. Inevitably some pieces of evidence and some problems of interpretation are relevant to more than one subsection of the argument, and there is a certain amount of repetition, but it is generally limited by careful cross-referencing. R.

also provides full references to earlier work, and the bibliography covers publications up to October 2002: Stylianou, A historical commentary on Diodorus Siculus Book 15 (Oxford, 1998) is the only major omission noted.

On a number of topics the combination of limited evidence and significant previous work leaves R. with little opportunity to do more than provide a lucid and reasoned exposition of the views of others: In section 1.1, for instance she accepts the widely held view (though challenged by Dušančić) that at the end of the Spartan-Elean war Sparta did not impose constitutional change but left the Elean democrats in control. R. also argues, surely rightly, that the exiled Elean oligarchs were allowed to return, and suggests that the Olympic victor Archidamos son of Xenias, dated by Moretti to 396, was a son of the oligarchic leader Xenias, and also perhaps the Elean ambassador Archidamos of 367 (so spelt in Xen. Hell. 7.1.33–8). She further suggests that, if that were so, Archidamos, presumably oligarchic, was paired as ambassador with the known democrat Argeios in a reflection of the tension between oligarchs and democrats in Elean politics at the time. These latter suggestions, while interesting and plausible, are – as R. recognises – purely speculative. There is a very useful survey (pp. 94–107) of the cult of Poseidon at Samikon, with its amphi-
ctyony, and of the importance of Makistos (or –on). The scattered evidence for archaeological finds is conveniently assembled, particularly for Triphylia, Lasion, and Letrinoi, Amphidoloi, and Marganeis. Occasionally R. notes previous work without committing herself to a judgment of it, as for instance (p. 29) Schilbach’s view that Elean pottery production can be shown to have fluctuated because of the Dekeleian War and the Spartan-Elean war, or (pp. 92 and 135) recent attempts to revive Kahrstedt’s view that there was an Olympic amphictyony.

Few of R.’s detailed arguments can obviously be faulted. A rare example is in the discussion (pp. 87–94) of a possible Triphylian dialect distinguishable from Elean: the marking of aspiration found in Triphylian inscriptions but not in Elean is clearly relevant, but the use of a differently-shaped gamma says nothing about dialect. The arguments used to claim (p. 120) that we have several pieces of evidence of Eleans acquiring land in periokic communities are not justified: the case of Pisatis is contentious (see below), while the entire territory of Epeion was purchased by the Elean state (with no known change of private ownership within the territory) and half the territory of Lepreon was ceded to the Elean state and then leased back to Lepreon (likewise with no known change of private ownership).

Where R. has the opportunity to be original she makes several good and persuasive suggestions. In discussing (pp. 119–132) how Xenophon could hold and purchase land at Skillous and be a Spartan proxenos, she argues from the wording of Anabasis 5.3.9–10 (‘the sons of Xenophon and those of the other citizens’) that Xenophon had been given Skillountian citizenship and will have been a more effective proxenos because of it. R. adds (pp. 136–7) that, because of the evidence for double citizenship, at federal and polis level, in the Triphylian confederacy, Xenophon will also have been a Triphylian citizen. R. also draws attention (pp. 95–6) to the mythical figure Triphyle, hitherto neglected in comparison to the widely known Triphylos son of Arkas: Triphyle was mother of Klytios, ancestor of the Klytiadai, seers at Olympia.

One topic that appears frequently in the book and is central to R.s understanding of Elean and periokic affairs is the changing number of Hellanodikai and the relation between that number and the number of Elean territorial tribes: her handling of it needs detailed comment.

The main evidence is given in Pausanias 5.9.4–6, and is a notorious puzzle, not clarified by the very small amount of other evidence. Pausanias says that in the 5th Olympiad a system of appointing two Hellanodikai was established: in the 25th (obviously a corrupt figure) the number was increased to nine (three each for the horse races, the pentathlon, and the other events), and two Olympiads later the number was increased to ten.
(probably, as R. suggests though Pausanias does not say so, to provide a chairman): in the
103rd (368), because there were 12 Elean tribes, the number was increased to 12, and in the
104th, because of losses of territory in the war against Arkadia, the number was reduced to
8: it was finally stabilised at 10 in the 108th. Various emendations have been proposed for
the corrupt date of the increase to nine Hellanodikai. R. prefers to see that as following the
end of the Spartan-Elean war: the change was obviously designed to ensure competent
administration of the games, and would have helped justify Elean control, after the Spar-
tans had considered removing that control.

R. also suggests that the Pisatans may have been given Elean citizenship in 400,
in order to secure Elean control of Pisatis at a time when Sparta was insisting that
all Elean perioikoii should set free: it would be difficult to reconcile her view with
the admittedly incomplete sources for the conditions imposed on Elis at the end
of the war, and it is much easier to believe that the Pisatans were already Elean
citizens when the war broke out. R. accepts (as has the reviewer) the ancient tra-
dition (admittedly preserved in conflicting forms) of clashes between Elis and Pi-
satis for control of Olympia, with Elis winning control in the first half of the
sixth century: in fact, since R.’s book appeared two articles have been published
reviving with strong arguments Niese’s view that the ancient tradition of wars
between Elis and Pisatis in the archaic period is a fabrication of the fourth centu-
ry, but R. had no opportunity to take note of these. It is not entirely clear how
R. envisages the condition of the Pisatans under Elean domination before
400: she suggests that they were subject to the Eleans, who controlled Olympia, and
that much land in Pisatis was probably given to Eleans (pp. 196–7). The main
problem however arises from R.’s interpretation of developments in 368 and 364
(or in each case shortly before these dates: R. rightly argues that, for an increase
in Hellanodikai to be effective in a given Olympiad, it would have to be put in
place before the games). Pausanias, as R. recognises (p. 46), makes a connection
between the number of Hellanodikai and the number of Elean tribes only for 368
and 364, and so there is no need for us to assume that prior to 368 there was a
link between the number of tribes and the number of Hellanodikai.

Nonetheless R. adopts the view held by many that Elean territory was increas-
ed in or shortly before 368 by granting Elean citizenship to perioikic communi-
ties over which Elis had gained control since the end of the Spartan-Elean war,
that the number of Elean territorial tribes was increased as a result, and that
the number of Hellanodikai was increased to match. The problems with this
view are that, firstly, there is no evidence for such a grant of citizenship, and
secondly, we should have to suppose that, even though the grant of citizenship
was supposedly made to secure the loyalty of perioikic communities, the grant
was withdrawn in 364, and was not restored even to those perioikic communities
over which Elis rapidly regained control (as R. recognises at p. 158 for Akroreia).
R. explains the reduction in the number of tribes (and Hellanodikai) as being due

1 A. Möller, Elis, Olympia, und das Jahr 580 v. Chr. Zur Frage der Eroberung von Pis-
tis, in: R. Rollinger and C. Ulf (edd.), Griechische Archaik. Interne Entwicklungen, exter-
ne Impulse, Berlin 2004, 249–270; M. Nafissi, Elei e Pisati. Geografia, storia e istituzioni
to the loss of Pisatis and of some recently enfranchised perioikic communities.\(^1\) She notes that the brief independent Pisatan state of c. 365–2 apparently had three Hellanodikai, raising the possibility that there were three territorial tribes in Pisatis, and supposes, very plausibly, that the number of Elean tribes (but not the number of Hellanodikai) will have been raised again when Pisatis once more became Elean, though such an increase is not actually attested. R.s view of the extensions of Elean citizenship is possible, but creates serious difficulties, both in supposing that the Pisatans did not receive Elean citizenship until 400 and in supposing that the Elean made a grant of citizenship (unattested in our sources) to the perioikoi they controlled in 368 and then withdrew the grant in 364 when they were fighting to hold on to such perioikoi as they still controlled and to win back others.

No other major topic in the book is so controversial, and the general impression created by the work is of a very thorough and prudent reconsideration of an important topic, with several attractive original suggestions. It must be consulted by anyone with an interest in the classical Peloponnesse, or in the general question of how self-governing Greek communities could be dominated by other Greeks.

Nottingham

James Roy

---

\(^1\) The reviewer has suggested that the reduction was due solely to the loss of Pisatis, in: M. H. Hansen (ed.) The polis as an urban centre and as a political community, Copenhagen 1997, 278–9.