The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

History of Epirus *Epirotische Geschichte bis zum Jahre 280 v. Chr.* Von Carl Klotzsch. I vol. 8vo. Pp. 240. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1911. M. 6.

Guy Dickins

The Classical Review / Volume 26 / Issue 06 / September 1912, pp 195 - 196

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00200358, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00200358

How to cite this article:

Guy Dickins (1912). The Classical Review, 26, pp 195-196 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00200358

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

HISTORY OF EPIRUS.

Epirotische Geschichte bis zum Jahre 280 v. Chr. Von CARL KLOTZSCH. I vol. 8vo. Pp. 240. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1911. M. 6.

No historian of Epirus can afford to ignore the geographical features of the country. It is probable that Herr Carl Klotzsch writes without a traveller's first-hand knowledge; otherwise he would not speak with such optimism of the communications between Onchesmus on the north-west coast and the Helloplan plain near the ancient Dodona (p. 9), or imply (on p. 1) that difficult mountain chains cut off this plain from Aetolia and the south. In reality, as he elsewhere remarks, the mountains of Epirus lie in ranges parallel with the coast. Thus the Helloplan plain, which is the fertile heart of the country, has at all times been most easily accessible from the south, and has therefore stood in close relations with the region of the Ambracian Gulf and not with the island of Corcyra.

This geographical fact throws considerable doubt on the thesis of the first chapter, in which the author follows Kärst's theory of a fifth-century Chaonian ἀρχή based on the statement of Theopompus in Strabo VII. 324, that the Chaonians ruled Epirus before the Molossians, and on ambiguous passages in Thucydides II. 80 and 81, where Chaonians receive particular mention as the μαχιμώτατοι τῶν περὶ ἐκεῖνα τὰ χωρία. The Chaonians lived on the north-west coast near Onchesmus, and therefore would perhaps be the best known of the Epirot tribes to the Greeks in the Ionian Islands, but the story of Themistocles at the Court of Admetus proves Molossian pre-eminence forty years before the Ambracian War celebrated by Thucydides. It is therefore natural to conclude that the Chaonian ἀρχή of Theopompus refers to a much earlier period, probably before the foundation of Ambracia created a safe trade-route through Aetolia to Calydon or Naupactus.

Herr Klotzsch is most successful when he deals with purely political history. He establishes by means of intricate

chronological arguments and a full use of scanty evidence a satisfactory table of the Epirot Kings from Tharyps to Pyrrhus. The most important point which he brings out is the division of the descendants of Alcetas I into two parties, Nationalist and pro-Macedonian. The sway of the political pendulum brought many changes of fortune, and we find Neoptolemus II enjoying three separate periods of power, divided by two six-year intervals of a Nationalist régime. The relations of Epirus with Athens and Sparta, and later with Pherae and Macedonia, are carefully studied on a basis of arguments which will, on the whole, find general acceptance. We might take exception, however, to the frequent use of the list of Pyrrhus' troops in Italy, given by Dionysius of Halicarnassus for establishing the extent of his dominions, since it cannot be argued that all the races introduced as μισθοφόροι were his actual subjects. One is also disappointed to find no adequate explanation of Pyrrhus' apparent faithlessness and folly in his dealings with Demetrius Poliorcetes. Plutarch seems to be followed here with too much docility. There is an occasional lack of proportion in the author's treatment of political events. Thus pp. 135-147 contain an account of the battle of Ipsus, with its causes and results, quite out of proportion to its importance from the Epirot point of view, while the Italian expedition of Alexander the Molossian is barely mentioned. Still, on the whole, the treatment of the political history of Epirus from 429-280 is a valuable addition to our knowledge.

On the other hand, the book is full of disappointments, for there is practically nothing but political history in it. Not only does this limitation create a certain tediousness in the end, but it entails the omission of two of the most interesting points in Epirot history—the ethnological origin of the inhabitants, especially as regards their Dorian affinities, and the explanation of the extraordinary late bloom of city-state culture, which produced the wonderful bronzes of Paramythia, and which surprises us in

the campaign of Aemilius Paulus with a record of 150,000 slaves ravished from 70 cities.

With neither of these points does the author attempt to deal. He leaves Epirus a land of villages and gives no hint of further development. A 50-line note on ethnology gives us little more information than Kärst's article in Pauly-Wissowa, and any further attention to the social and economic, quite apart from the ethnological, position of Epirus is strictly banned. The mention of the *προστάται* with their analogies in the Spartan ephors, the exceptional position of women, the traces of dual kingship, and even the striking oath given in Plutarch, which exactly reproduces the monthly oath of the Spartan Kings, fail to stir the author to a discussion of this problem. The question of Dodona and its bronze age receives

no serious consideration. Even the constitutional system is not fully treated, and we are left very vague in our ideas of the relations of King, *prostates*, and League.

Minor points of criticism are the want of a bibliography or a list of abbreviations, some haste in the compiling of the Index, and an irritating want of system in transliteration, which admits of Lysimacheia and Lysimachia, Chae-rona and Koroneia, Euboea and Beroia, Epirus and Ephesos, Pyrrhus and Demetrios, Aeacus and Aeakides.

Still, Herr Klotzsch's success in reconstructing Epirot political history is such that we lay down the book with regret at its abrupt closure in 280 B.C., just when it was beginning to be really interesting.

GUY DICKINS.

THE THUNDER-WEAPON IN RELIGION AND FOLKLORE.

The Thunder-weapon in Religion and Folklore. A Study in Comparative Archaeology. By CHR. BLINKENBERG, Ph.D. Cambridge Archaeological and Ethnological Series. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 122. 36 phototype and outline illustrations. Cambridge University Press, 1911. 5s.

DR. BLINKENBERG has given us a model monograph, learned, cautious, yet illuminating. What emerges from the great wealth of regional facts surveyed is, briefly, as follows:

Over three continents—Europe, Asia, and Africa—in those regions where thunderstorms are fairly frequent and violent, the belief in thunderstones has existed and still exists. That is, it is believed (in contradiction, of course, to actual fact) that the destructive stroke of the lightning is caused by the descent of a stone. Flash and thunderclap are mere accessories. In regions where thunderstorms are absent or unimportant, *e.g.* Iceland and Egypt, the belief may exist, but it is imported, not indigenous. But on the two remaining continents—America and Australia—though thunderstorms abound, such a

belief is practically unknown, or, when known, clearly imported. In America, *e.g.* thunder is produced by a large thunderbird; in Australia it is associated with the bull-roarer. Dr. Blinkenberg concludes that the Old-world belief in thunderstones and their manifold virtues originated in one, not several, centres.

In Europe, Asia, and Africa it is most frequently pre-historic stone antiquities, flint weapons, celts, etc., that pass for thunderstones; but besides these—the point is important—other stones of notable shape, colour, appearance, *e.g.*, belemnites, echinites, rock crystals, globular stones, are accounted as having the same origin and the like magical powers. Now it is in regard to this question of stone-implements as thunder-weapons that the originality of Dr. Blinkenberg's view comes in. Somewhat unconsciously it would seem, but all the more convincingly, he stands for the new psychology as contrasted with the elder rationalism. He marks an epoch in the interpretation of religious phenomena. The older school still finds the origin of man's religion in his primitive scientific curiosity. He found