

РЕЦЕНЗІЇ / REVIEWS

UDC 930(477):94(3)
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.24.264744

Oleh PETRECHKO

PhD hab. (History), Professor, Head of the World History and Special Historical Disciplines department, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Street, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (o.petrechko@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0002-5535-3730

Yulian BEK

PhD (Law), Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Civil law and procedure Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, 1 Universytetska Street, Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79000 (yulian.bek@lnu.edu.ua)

ORCID: 0000-0002-8042-5492

ResearcherID: GRR-7453-2022

Олег ПЕТРЕЧКО

доктор історичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (o.petrechko@ukr.net)

Юліан БЕК

кандидат юридичних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри цивільного права та процесу Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка, вул. Університетська, 1, м. Львів, Україна, індекс 79000 (yulian.bek@lnu.edu.ua)

A NEW RESEARCH OF THE PTOLEMAIC KINGDOM IN UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY (review of the monograph: From the Basileis-Pharaohs to the Pharaohs-Basileis: the First 100 Years of the Ptolemaic Monarchy: a monograph / Zelinskyi A. L. Vinnytsia; Kyiv: LLC "WORKS", 2020. 648 p.)

НОВЕ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ЦАРСТВА ПТОЛЕМЕЇВ В УКРАЇНСЬКІЙ ІСТОРИОГРАФІЇ (рецензія на монографію: Від басилевсів-фараонів до фараонів-басилевсів: перші 100 років птолемейської монархії: монографія / Зелінський А. Л. Вінниця; Київ: ТОВ "ТВОРИ", 2020. 648 с.)

In 2020, Kyiv researcher Andrii Zelinskyi published the monograph "From the Basileis-Pharaohs to the Pharaohs-Basileis: the First 100 Years of the Ptolemaic Monarchy". The previous monograph on this topic was published by the author ten years earlier under the title "The Alexandrian Pharaohs and Their Subjects. Strengthening the Power of the First Ptolemies

/ Zelinskyi A. L. Kyiv: Akadempriodyca, 2010. 664 p.” (Александрійські фараони та їхні піддані. Зміцнення влади перших Птолемеїв / Зелінський А. Л. Київ: Академперіодика, 2010. 664 с.). It was then the first Ukrainian monograph devoted to Hellenistic issues in general, and the history of the Ptolemaic state in particular. In 2021, Andrii Zelinskyi defended his dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Historical Sciences (World History) on the topic: The evolution of the Ptolemaic monarchy as the social-political institution (end of IV – end of III cent. BC). It could therefore be stated that the author of the reviewed monograph, who is currently a staff member of the State Institution “Institute of World History of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine”, is well-versed in the subject of research.

The topic of the scientific research of Andrii Zelinskyi is in the mainstream of modern Hellenistic studies. In recent years, scholars have actively studied and compared Egyptian and non-Egyptian elements that coexisted in various spheres of the Ptolemaic state: socio-political, socio-economic, religious and ideological. This monographic study was carried out in the same vein. The author focused on the study of the evolution of the Ptolemaic monarchy from the end of the 4th – to the end of the 3rd century BC. The starting point for the research was the dualism of the Ptolemaic monarchy stated in modern historiography: each ruler, to one degree or another, appears both as a Greek-Macedonian basileus and as an Egyptian pharaoh. On this basis, A. Zelinskyi considers the Ptolemaic monarchy as a socio-political institution; he traces the dynamics of changes in the ratio of Greco-Macedonian and Egyptian elements during the first hundred years of the dynasty's existence. Many problems, explicitly or implicitly researched by the author of the book, are the subject of academic discussions nowadays. Consequently, the study of the Ptolemaic monarchy as a coherent system combining Egyptian and Classical antiquity elements determines the validity and importance of A. Zelinskyi's monograph.

The structure of the work is well thought out, which allowed the author to elucidate the research topic. In the first chapter the author gives a brief overview of the historiography of the problem and gives a description of the research base of the study. In particular, the author notes that “modern historiography does not try to consistently trace not only the evolution of the Ptolemaic monarchy as a socio-political institution, but also research the impact of this evolution on shifting the power priorities of the Ptolemaic dynasty” (p. 17). The author analyzes the importance of different types of sources for the study of certain aspects of the problem, characterizes the main typological groups and content categories into which the source base of the study is divided. The author considers it appropriate to classify the “Parian Chronicle” and a number of other such monuments in the narrative group of sources (p. 18). Inter alia A. Zelinskyi quite reasonably distinguishes onomastic sources (p. 27). This is fully consistent with the research methods used by the author, including historical and comparative, historical and genetic ones. The author's use of the methodology of historical institutionalism with its neo-institutional component (p. 32) seems to be quite reasonable. A. Zelinskyi defines two main elements of the Ptolemaic monarchy, which, in his opinion, are the most characteristic, respectively, of the institutions of basileus and pharaoh. In the first case it is a permanent personal military activity of the monarch in the Mediterranean region, which cannot be separated from the essence of the Greco-Macedonian, and later – the Hellenistic *basileia*; in the second – the ritual and material support of the cosmic order (*Maat*) on which the legitimacy of the power of each pharaoh was based (p. 31). The following four chapters of the monograph are devoted to the trends in ratios of these components.

Each of these chapters is associated with the figure of one of the four Ptolemies, starting with the founder of the dynasty, Ptolemy I Soter, then Ptolemy II Philadelphus,

Ptolemy III Euergetes and Ptolemy IV Philopator. In each chapter, a certain system is traced, which can be designated by three blocks: 1. conditions for the formation of personality and personality traits of the respective monarch; 2. the analysis of his foreign policy; 3. the study of his domestic policy. The author elucidates the subjective factors associated with the figure of a particular representative of the Ptolemaic dynasty, which are necessary for a comprehensive understanding of the complex processes that took place within the evolution of the Ptolemaic monarchy; he analyzes the scale of the representation of a particular king as a warrior-basileus; and finally, the author determines to what extent each of the four Ptolemies corresponds to the expectations of the indigenous Egyptians. Chapter 5 is slightly different and ends with a paragraph devoted to the influence of the evolution of the Ptolemaic monarchy during this period on the further historical development of Hellenistic Egypt.

The concept of A. Zelinskyi, by and large, can be summarized as follows: the study of the first hundred years of the Ptolemaic monarchy enables us to speak of the gradual refusal of the rulers of that dynasty to actively perform the functions of Basileis and to intensify their activities as pharaohs. Ptolemy I Soter spent almost his entire life in war campaigns and acted as a full-fledged basileus, while his pharaoh functions were rather an imitation. Ptolemy II Philadelphus eventually refused to participate in wars directly; his activity as a pharaoh was fulfilled, first of all, through regular temple tours. Ptolemy III Euergetes eventually completely rejected the military component of foreign policy, and that, according to the author, was a premise of the impending catastrophe in foreign policy; at the same time, owing to many targeted measures, his internal political positions were strengthened. The decision-making biases related to the personality of Ptolemy IV Philopator caused a systemic crisis of power institutions that undermined the authority of the Ptolemaic monarchy. However, the emphasis of his predecessor on the performance of the functions of the pharaoh helped to maintain the power of the Ptolemies in Egypt, although Ptolemy V Epiphanes was forced de facto to abandon “external possessions”, the acquisition, maintenance and expansion of which were completely associated with the functions of the Basileus. The choice of Ptolemy V and his successors for the Egyptian component, made at the cost of abandoning expansionist foreign policy, was due to the gradual change in the nature of the Ptolemaic monarchy, which took place during the reign of the first representatives of the dynasty.

In the monograph, A. Zelinskyi put forward a number of interesting hypotheses, proposed a number of reconstructions, and expressed his own idea for a wide range of issues related to the foreign and domestic policy of the Ptolemaic state. He proposed, inter alia, his own interpretation of the events of the Third and Fourth Wars of the Diadochi (pp. 44-47, 72-73), the First, the Second and especially the Third Syrian Wars; a new understanding of the principles of Egyptian foreign policy during the time of Ptolemy IV (pp. 191-200). The author presented new arguments in favour of the historicity of the Egyptian coronation of Ptolemy I (pp. 265, 292); considerably expanded the history and geography of visiting Egyptian temples by Ptolemies (pp. 113-114); established the stages of the formation of the Egyptian version of the personal lifetime cult of the ruling monarch during the time of Ptolemy III Euergetes (pp. 147-175); made a number of remarks on the content of the Raphia Decree (pp. 206-207); gave arguments in favor of the effective participation of the Theban priesthood of Amun in the Great Rebellion (207/206 – 186 BC) (pp. 208-209, 515).

A. Zelinskyi made every effort to draw his own conclusions on certain aspects of the problem under investigation, based on the widest possible range of historical sources. Besides the author proved ability in the scope of methodology for investigating the historical sources,

including papyrological, numismatic and epigraphic ones. A. Zelinskyi is well grounded in the field of classical languages as can be seen from his translation of an Athenian poet Philemon's epigram about Magas and Ptolemy II (p. 329), the translation of the epigram of Callimachus about the Cretan archer (p. 404), the original interpretation of the fragment by Livy (p. 502), the analysis of the epigrams of Posidippus of Pella (pp. 373–374, 403), etc. It should also be noted that some A. Zelinskyi's translations of ancient texts were already published since 2005.

A. Zelinskyi knows the historiography of the problem thoroughly. The book's bibliography contains 1720 items (pp. 533–647).

Appreciating the scientific work of A. Zelinskyi's, let us make a few remarks. We fully approve of the principles and research methods used by the author, including the method of philological criticism, which is absolutely correct in the context of the study of this topic, but not very popular with historians. We consider the terminological principle of the research also deserves attention. The author does not discuss this principle directly, but applies it many times, in particular referring to the meaning of the term "Hellenism". Apparently, some other terms ought to be defined and clarified, for example – "*basileia*" (pp. 31, 517, 518), used in the phrases "*Greek-Macedonian basileia*" (pp. 30, 31), "*Hellenistic basileia*" (pp. 31, 33), "*pre-Hellenistic basileia*" (p. 33).

The author emphasized that he chose "historical institutionalism" as a methodological basis for his research (p. 32). Therefore, as far as we are concerned, it may be worth clarifying the essence of the concept of "institution", which is repeatedly used by the author, but has its own specifics depending on the context: economic, legal, historical, etc. By broadening this point, we think it would be worthwhile to provide an explanation of some terms in a "glossary of terms" or in the notes. For example, the author used the terms "republic" and "republican", as well as a number of phrases with them. Of course, the definition of "Republic" has different meanings in phrases the "Roman Republic" (pp. 210, 213, 223), the "Island Republic" and the "Merchant Republic" when it comes to Rhodes (p. 59, 61, 197, 397) or the "New Republic" in the case of Cyrenaica (p. 109). In some cases, it would be appropriate to put these terms in quotes. In our opinion, it was unfitting to render Greek terms in Roman alphabet: "*βασιλικοί παῖδες*" – "*basilikoi paides*" (p. 257), "*ἀπό μέλιτος*" – "*apomelitos*" (p. 97), etc.,

Summing up, it should be noted that A. Zelinskyi's monograph made a valuable contribution to the development of Ukrainian historiographies of antiquity; it might interest a wide range of professional historians, students and connoisseurs of ancient history.

The article was received April 02, 2022.

Article recommended for publishing 30/08/2022