

Katharina Knäpper, *Hieros kai Asylos. Territoriale Asylie im Hellenismus in ihrem historischen Kontext (Historia – Einzelschriften 250)*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2018,
348 pp. + 8 maps;
ISBN 978-3-515-11992-4

The right to asylum is a legal institution of the Greek world that is well known to scholars. Both individuals and temples could benefit from this right. In individual cases, it was exclusively the city authorities that decided on whether to grant it. For a temple to obtain the title of *asylia*, on the other hand, respected locally and further afield, this demanded a more complex procedure. In the Greek world, the number of temples with the right to asylum changed over time, as did the rules for its granting. A particularly high number of cases of applications for the privilege are known from the Hellenistic era. We know of them largely from epigraphic sources, and also to a limited extent from literary evidence. Despite the large amount of papers written on temple asylum in the Hellenistic era, the issue continues to attract scholars' attention. One of the most recent manifestations of this interest is Katharina Knäpper's book, based on her PhD dissertation completed in 2013 at the University of Münster. In the published version, the author also took into account at least some of the later publications.

Knäpper's research essentially focuses on the question of territorial asylum, its functions, the ways it was acquired, the relations between the city and the temple applying for asylum, and the political context of this procedure. Examining the concepts applied when studying the problem of religious asylum in antiquity, the author also concentrates on the issue of individual asylum ("Das Wortfeld Hikesie: Entwicklung der Schutzgewährung im sakralen Raum von der archaischen bis in die hellenistische Zeit," pp. 42–68). Her research mainly concerns the period from the second half of the 3rd century BCE, when temples first sought to obtain asylum rights, to 22/23 CE, when the Roman senate at the bidding of emperor Tiberius appointed a list of those temples granted this privilege (Tac. *Ann.* 3.60–63; cf. 4.14.1). In terms of geography, the research is limited to area of the Aegean Sea and the western part of Asia Minor. This geographical framework was dictated by the fact that it was in this area that the most epigraphical evidence survives, making it possible to examine the problem relatively extensively.

After presenting her objectives and methodology ("Einleitung," pp. 11–21), the author presents the state of research on the right to asylum and the content of the concepts of *asylia* and *hikesia* at length, as well as their evolution over time, from the Archaic period to the Hellenistic period ("Die Wurzeln der territorialen Asylie. *Hikesie*, persönliche Asylie und die Neutralität sakraler Räume," pp. 22–74). The reflections on

the significance of these concepts are important for understanding them in the context of the period in which they were used. They are justified since scholars extremely frequently confuse the ancient concept of asylum with its modern meaning. The author demonstrates that in antiquity it has different contents, and also that various terms were also used to describe possession of the right to asylum, depending on the status of the entity benefiting from this right. One example is *hikesia*, a form of religious asylum granted to individuals. Knäpper reaches the important conclusion that in the Archaic and the Classical period the right to asylum had both a political and a religious dimension, but it took various forms.

The next chapter (“Territoriale Asylie des dritten und zweiten Jahrhunderts in epigraphischen und literarischen Quellen,” pp. 75–248) forms the nucleus of the book. It presents the current state of research on the right to asylum in the Hellenistic period, discusses the sources available for this research, and above all compiles and analyses cases of applications for the right to asylum from this period. The data contained in the sources demonstrates not only the sometimes vast scale of organisational and diplomatic ventures undertaken by cities, which sent emissaries (often repeatedly) to various political and religious entities with a request for confirmation that they respected the rights to territorial asylum of the temples in their territory, but also an array of arguments for supporting these requests. These throw a great deal of light on relations between the party initiating the application and the one to which it was addressed. The sources leave no doubt that both parties were extremely interested in these contacts, as the declaration of respecting asylum also created the opportunity to expand mutual relations beyond the religious sphere. Attempts to confirm the right to asylum contributed to the development of relations between cities, political unions and rulers. In the final reckoning, they contributed to strengthening the political position of the institutions applying for the right to asylum, especially at times when the general situation in the Hellenistic world was unstable.

The next chapter (“Territoriale Asylie des ersten Jahrhunderts und der frühen Kaiserzeit in literarischen und epigraphischen Quellen. Kontinuitäten, Evolutionen, Brüche,” pp. 249–269) focuses on presenting issues related to the operation of territorial asylum in a period when Rome was playing an increasing role in the eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea basin. The amount of evidence from this period is much less than from before; it also largely comes from the western part of Asia Minor. The evidence also differs, since it usually comprises references demonstrating the possession of the right to asylum. The list of temples with the right to asylum does not overlap with that from the earlier period. It contains institutions lacking this right, creating a broad area for discussion on the circumstances and time of its acquisition. Based on these sources, we can also determine that even those that previously possessed the right and lost it, not always in known circumstances, after a time regained it. They also make it clear that with Rome’s increased engagement in Asia Minor, the previous ways of obtaining the right to asylum were no longer justified. This privilege began to depend on the will of the Roman generals, governors or politicians, who treated it as a reward for a specific political disposition. This was often connected with measurable material benefits. As a result, compared to the period of the 4th–3rd centuries BCE, the nature of the right to asylum changed, coming to resemble its modern-day meaning.

The main part of the book is concluded by a concise summary of the conclusions resulting from the author's research ("Schlussbetrachtung," pp. 270–276). This is followed by several appendices ("Anhang," pp. 277–314), comprising, in addition to a collection of epigraphical texts on the issue of asylum which were not included by K. J. Rigsby in his corpus of texts from 1996 (*Asyilia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley–Los Angeles), two lists: 1) all known delegations sent by Greek cities concerning asylum ("Tabellarische Auflistung der Gesandtschaften," pp. 298–311), and 2) public places in which documents concerning confirmation of the right to asylum were published ("Tabellarische Auflistung der Veröffentlichungswege der Asylie," pp. 312–314).

Katharina Knäpper's research method makes her book a valuable contribution to knowledge on the right to territorial asylum in the Greek world in the Hellenistic period. Particularly worth emphasising is her demonstration of the changes in the content of the concept of asylum itself (and similar terms) over time, from the Archaic to the Roman period. Understanding it correctly in various eras or periods is an essential key for correct interpretation of the phenomena and behaviours associated with temples' acquisition and possession of the right to territorial asylum. The source analysis carried out by the author also demonstrates the multifaceted nature of the applications of the various cities to obtain or confirm the right to asylum for the sanctuaries in their territory, as they were accompanied by numerous events and phenomena not obviously connected with them. In the light of these conclusions, the right to asylum takes on new meaning as an element of the prestige and political position of the institutions that possessed it.

Edward Dąbrowa

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9324-9096>

Jagiellonian University in Kraków