M. Baebius Tamphilus in 192 was only small (P. A. Brunt, *Italian Manpower 225 BC–AD 14* [Oxford, 1971], pp. 657–8; Briscoe, *Commentary*, pp. 37–8).

University of Nottingham J. W. RICH
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni129

THE AEACIDS

S. FUNKE: *Aiakidenmythos und epirotisches Königtum. Der Weg einer hellenischen Monarchie*. Pp. 238. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2000. Paper, DM 80. ISBN: 3-515-07611-5.

In this lightly revised version of her 1995 dissertation, F. sets out to discover why the Molossian state came to have a royal dynasty at its head (p. 17). She believes that the mythical genealogy of the 'Pelasgian' Aeacids, rulers of the Molossian ethnos, provides an answer, as well as an insight into the early history of Epirus.

The monograph is divided into two parts. The first part is devoted to the mythical ancestry of the Aeacidae. In the seventh century, argues F., two different stories were in circulation concerning the return of Achilles' son Neoptolemus after the sack of Troy. One is preserved in the *Odyssey* (3.188–9, 4.4–9), according to which he went home to Phthia with the Myrmidons. The other subsisted in the Epic Cycle, where Neoptolemus was first linked with Epirus. There follows an analysis of sections from Pindar's *Paean* 6 and *Nemean Odes* 7 and 4, which report variant traditions about Neoptolemus' wanderings, including his death at Delphi. Pindar did not consciously elaborate the genealogical origins of the Molossian dynasty when he incorporated legendary elements involving Achilles and Neoptolemus in his epinician odes, and even caused offence: *Nem*. 7.53–65. (F. does not explore the admission in these lines that Pindar acted as *proxenos*: of the Molossians? See now I. Malkin, 'Greek Ambiguities: Between "Ancient Hellas" and "Barbarian Epirus" ', in I. Malkin [ed.], *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* [Harvard 2001], p. 202). Likewise, the fifth-century dramatists used several variants of the Neoptolemus story when handling Trojan themes (pp. 59–81). So it is not clear why F. allocates so much of her discussion to literary traditions that do little to advance her thesis. A revival of scholarly interest in the Aeacids is attributed to Theopompus' digression on the ancestry of Philip II's Molossian bride, Olympias. Meanwhile, Hector's widow Andromache was made the mother of four Epirote founder-heroes, while a different trend integrated Pyrrhus' ancestry with the Heraclids (pp. 95–101). Perhaps what the reader misses here most is a clearer spatial awareness. If location matters, as the concretion of stories that connect people—dynasties—with certain locations would suggest, why no consideration of Dodona, which the *Iliad* links, albeit in a round about way, with Achilles (*Il*. 16.234)?

The second part of the book traces the political history of the kingdom of Epirus, from the earliest regional associations recorded in the *Nostoi*, through the first documented Aeacid rulers: Alcon, one of the suitors of Agariste, the tyrant Cleisthenes' daughter at Sicyon (Hdt. 6.126–30); Admetus, who provided Themistocles with a stopping-off point *c*. 470 B.C.; Tharyps in the early years of the Peloponnesian War; and Alcetas, who joined the Second Athenian Confederacy (pp. 104–58). There are more nuances to be sought in the reign of Philip II of Macedon and Alexander the Molossian (pp. 159–88). A brief review of the succeeding rulers, down to the end of

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni130 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the dynasty's association with Epirote power in 232 B.C., completes this survey (pp. 189–218). The division of the subject matter truncates F.'s argument. If the mythical status of the Molossian kings played a significant part in the constitutional character of Epirus, these links are but occasionally picked up in the chronological discussion.

F. is primarily concerned with dynastic myths, but insofar as she includes the kingdom of Epirus in the scope of her work, she broaches some highly topical themes in the study of early Aegean state formation, notably the use of myth in the forging of community origins, and the history of *ethne*. It is a pity that F. has not incorporated relevant research papers of the Copenhagen Polis Centre in her discussion (many of which have likewise been published by Steiner), or consulted, for example, Jonathan Hall's *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1997), which explored the relationship between myth-making and community identities. By focusing exclusively on the mythical origins of the Molossian royal dynasty, F. has side-stepped the question of how the monarchy fitted into, or aggregated, the administrative structures of the Molossian ethnos, and of the Epirote *koinon*, which came to be dominated by the Molossians. These institutional structures, which are documented in inscriptions from the second quarter of the fourth century B.C. onwards, provide important evidence of the mechanisms of government. F. is aware of this material; she explores and discusses many of these documents (pp. 127–58, 174–88), but does not use the evidence they provide to clarify the respective rôles of ruler and magistrates or elected officials. She rightly draws attention to the constitutional nature of royal power, but the biographical narratives relating to Arybbas, Alexander the Molossian, and Pyrrhus, which form the backbone of her historical analysis (pp. 159–215), illuminate the internal affairs of Epirus in a rather partial manner. In view of Macedonia's close political relations with Epirus, particularly from the reign of Philip II onwards (pp. 159–88), F. might have considered more seriously the institutional parallels between the two kingdoms, which M. Hatzopoulos has referred to in his *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings* (Athens, 1996), pp. 101–4, 327–8, and elsewhere.

University of Liverpool ZOFIA HALINA ARCHIBALD
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni130

ROMULUS AND REMUS

A. MEURANT: *L'idée de gémellité dans la légende des origines de Rome*. Pp. 335. Brussels: Académie Royale de Belgique, 1997. Paper, BFr 1200. ISBN: 2-8031-0175-0.

M. attempts to situate the literary tradition of the Roman founders Romulus and Remus on a wider canvas of world mythological traditions for twin gods and heroes, and more specifically to identify the relationship of the twin founders to parallel traditions in neighboring Indo-European mythologies. As M. demonstrates, so common a phenomenon as twin births (statistically, one in eighty births worldwide) was greeted throughout world cultures by a mixture of awe and dread. Societies viewed the birth of twins as a disturbance in the natural order of things and as a harbinger of momentous events.

Despite the obvious parallels with the Greek Dioscuri or the Sanskrit Aśvin twins, the Roman founders' myth poses a number of discrepancies to the Indo-European norm. Just as human twins tend to display contrasting extroverted/dominant and

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni130 Published online by Cambridge University Press