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The Trialectics of Knowledge, Space and Identity in Ancient Civilizations and in the Study of Antiquity

Topoi research group B-4 Space – Identity – Locality focuses its research on the interconnections between knowledge, space and identities. A multiplicity of sources – texts, images, architecture and objects – are analyzed both in their historical context and for their historiographic value. Following a brief description of the projects, key concepts of knowledge, space and identity are outlined as they relate to our specific research themes. We use ‘trialectics’ to emphasize that knowledge, space and identity constitute and influence each other. Concrete configurations of this constantly changing interplay of factors are illustrated by two case studies – the ritual compositions from Kizzuwatna (present southern Turkey) and the coin hoard of Krepost (present Bulgaria).

Numismatics; Hittites; knowledge; identity; ritual; space.

1 Introduction

In the last few decades, the perspectives on knowledge, space and identity have changed and brought these notions closer together. In our article, we use the idea of trialectics in an attempt to emphasize the constant mutual interaction of knowledge, space and identity. The focus of much previous research in classics and traditional archaeology has been on the reconstruction of a ‘truthful’ past (e.g. by reconstructing master texts or the primary function of objects). In this process, variants and modifications were mainly categorized negatively as mistakes, misunderstandings or deviations and, therefore, neglected. The members of the research group focus on such variants, investigating their meanings and the processes and actors associated with them. At the center of our interest is the question of how knowledge, space and identities constitute each other. Ancient processes of globalization and universalization, regionalization and particularization shape our case studies.

The subjects of our research are intentionally disparate and include texts, coins, objects, architecture and images, ranging from the ancient Near East to prehistory, from...
numismatics to ritual texts and from the 2nd millennium BCE to Roman times (Fig. 1). Another dimension of our project concerns historiographic issues, specifically narratives of modern times about the nexus between space and identity in the past. We therefore distinguish conceptually among three temporal levels: antiquity, the history of studying the past, and a reflexive attitude towards our own present. In the following, we first give a brief overview of specific projects, and we then turn to a discussion of conceptual issues by laying out our understanding of the notions of knowledge, space and identity. Finally, we illustrate these issues with two examples.

![Fig. 1 | Research group B-4 Space – Identity – Locality and its research projects.](image)

# 2 Projects of the research group B-4

The project *The Art of Conjuration – An Example of the Regionalization of ‘Global’ Knowledge* focuses on two questions: What part did local ritual ‘schools’ and/or their specific ritual textual traditions play in relation to general ancient Near Eastern knowledge about conjuration? What role did identities constructed in the mutual interaction between space and knowledge – identities that researchers may have been too quick to interpret in an essentialist way – play from both an emic and etic perspective?

The research project *Region and Memoria: Local History and Local Myths on Thracian Provincial Coins* documents and examines the minting of coins of the two *poleis* Philippopolis and Pautalia in Thrace in the imperial Roman period. The focus in this comparative analysis lies particularly on local expressions of polis identities.

Migration narratives play an important role in the constitution of identity spaces. They are a key motif in both historical records and academic representations of ancient history. Both reveal specific narrative patterns and are at the same time integrated in contemporary politics of identity. The project *Migration Narratives and Landscape of Identity* investigates the
connections between migration narratives in antiquity and those of scholars of antiquity: how did the former influence the latter and what conclusions can be drawn about the relationship between the ancient and modern knowledge systems?

The interactions and dynamics of a specific trialectic space|identity|knowledge in material contexts are examined in the project Shifting Things and Identity. Here, the main emphasis lies on those situations of cultural exchange and transfer of knowledge in which things are spatially and socially mobile, are transformed and adapted, yet at the same time themselves produce, transform and translate spaces. The cultural integration of Roman goods in Central German contexts is analyzed as a dynamics of social practices and networks. The analysis of practices is intended to provide avenues through which to address the material processes of identity (de)construction and reconfiguration.

The aim of the project Thirdspaces: The early 1st Millennium BCE in Northern Mesopotamia is to investigate the emergence of Thirdspaces in the two contemporaneous empires of Assyria and Urartu. Starting from the knowledge that there were prisoners of war from Urartu in Assyria and Assyrian prisoners of war in Urartu, the basic assumption is that these soldiers were exposed to an unfamiliar context and at the same time, as prisoners of war, suffered a loss of status. The analysis of extant historic monuments in Northern Iraq (core of Assyria) and Urartu allows us to reconstruct Urartian perceptions of space in Assyria and Assyrian perceptions of space in Urartu. Prisoner-specific subaltern subject positions and Thirdspace as defined by the geographer E. Soja are the framework for this project.²

3 Key concepts

Since the concepts of knowledge, space and identity are central to the research group, we lay out our understanding of those terms and outline their interaction. In inter- and transdisciplinary cooperation, the foremost desire is to agree on at least a common working understanding of key concepts thus reducing the impact of the heterogeneity of the different disciplines in that respect. However, with concepts as complex as knowledge, space and identity and their multifarious relations, this would inevitably lead to meaninglessly generalized definitions. It therefore makes more sense to follow Edward Said and Mieke Bal and regard knowledge, space and identity as traveling concepts.³ Instead of reducing the three concepts to a transdisciplinary level of generalized usefulness, they will be opened up in translational work on the object of research, thereby becoming more concrete, historicized and contextualized.⁴

2 Soja 1996; Soja 1999
3 Said 1997; Bal 2002; Bal 2011; see also Frank 2009; Neumann and Nünning 2012; Frietsch 2013
4 Cf. Bachmann-Medick 2002; Bachmann-Medick 2014
3.1 Knowledge

What we know, as opposed to what we believe, is true by definition.\(^5\)

Knowledge is used in our projects in two differing ways: firstly, as explicit knowledge, which in most cases can be verbalized, and secondly, as *tacit knowing*, which is anchored in practical implementation (Fig. 2).\(^6\)

---

\(^5\) Burke 2000, 5; cf. also Burke 2001, esp. 11–12 on the historical contextualization of knowledge.

\(^6\) Polanyi 1966; Characteristically, Michael Polanyi’s *knowing* is usually taken to mean *knowledge*, which thereby implies that the process-like character is re-essentialized. On consolidation, updating, ex- and internalization and representation, cf. Nonaka and Takeuchi 1995. Even if the SECI model of knowledge dimensions of Nonaka and Takeuchi is a completely functionalized understanding of knowledge, driven solely by instrumental reasoning of modern commercial enterprises and the validity for pre-capitalist societies might be questioned, it is one of the few conceptual designs that try to capture the interrelationships of different kinds of knowledge; for a critique of managerial knowledge conceptions see Virno 2004.

---

Fig. 2 | Conversion of explicit and implicit forms of knowledge through socialization, externalization, combination and internalization (SECI Model) following Nonaka and Takeuchi 1995, 56–73.
These two dimensions of knowledge intersect with another dimension of knowledge, its embodiedness. There is a large area of overlap between discursive and explicit knowledge, as well as between embodied and tacit knowledge. However, embodied knowledge can certainly be explicit, and much of a culture’s discursive knowledge is tacit (e.g. grammar’s role in quotidian speech).

Written sources display discursive knowledge that is at the same time mostly explicit. For this type of knowledge we employ a definition which meets the following basic conditions:

1. The concept of knowledge is used to refer to truth claims or objectivity and validity;
2. Knowledge has an affirmative object of reference, i.e. it is understood as knowledge of or about something.

A further requirement, that knowledge must be capable of being represented independently of a specific situation, cannot be met due to the context dependency of the discourses of our projects. This raises a series of questions and problems. For instance, the question arises as to the form in which relevant claims of validity can be satisfied and the role the symbolic representation of knowledge has for subjects – and vice versa –, i.e. whether knowledge only exists if it is ‘updated’ or whether knowledge also exists independent of persons as a background repository of types of knowledge that can be updated at any time and are rooted in a living environment.

In addition, access to or the dissemination of discursive knowledge between and within exclusively or predominantly oral societies is different from that in societies which have the medium of writing at their command. But expert knowledge that can be explicitly formulated also develops in ‘oral societies’. Examples are the different stocks of knowledge in the field of skilled crafts, such as mining and metal-working or technologies of pottery production. As Ann Brysbaert points out, such forms of knowledge tend to emerge in social discourse particularly when differing specialists contribute to the production of one and the same object. However, we also need to keep the possibility in mind that knowledge is/can be monopolized, that access can be severely restricted for ritual reasons.

Yet there are also forms of knowledge that are not open to discourse and which are considerably more difficult to analyze. These kinds of knowledge mostly appear to be inscribed in the human body as a result of mimetic learning in such a way that it is difficult to describe them for those who master them. It is necessary to distinguish among different variants of this type of knowledge. We differentiate between action-centered practical knowledge and perceptive practical knowledge.

A graphic example of action-centered practical knowledge is David Sudnow’s attempt to describe piano improvisation analytically. It becomes apparent that embodied knowledge is extremely complex and, in its fundamental properties, resembles series of gestures associated with varying degrees of skillfulness. Descriptions are generally inadequate approximations of such embodied knowledge. In the field of technology, we

---

8 For a general discussion of the differences between expert knowledge and general or received knowledge: Schütz 1972 87; Sprondel and Grathoff 1979.
9 Even here, however, implicit forms of knowledge are involved, cf. Castro Gessner 2008.
10 Brysbaert 2011.
14 Sudnow 1978.
translate such knowledge through the concept of the *chaîne opératoire* into a necessarily schematic representation.\(^\text{15}\)

However, *tacit knowing* can also be reconstructed through phenomenological approaches that systematically examine sensory impressions.\(^\text{16}\) In this process, perceptual modes – in part analytically decoded according to individual sensory perceptions – are reconstructed through a detailed examination of as many sources as possible. Material culture, for example, is always also a set of “stimulants to visual experiences” and thus suitable for accessing past visual cultures, which for their part helped to constitute ancient collective subjectivities.\(^\text{17}\)

Knowledge can be represented in different ways, in objects and in social practices or in particular actors, yet it is always the result of a negotiation in which knowledge is tried out or applied, checked or modified, preserved or rejected, etc. Such negotiated knowledge does not necessarily have to be discursive and therefore available for scrutiny. Nor does it develop under conditions of equality.\(^\text{18}\) In a historical dimension, the difficult consequence is that we must not reduce the question of truth claims to discursive, well-founded argumentation, rational verifiability and lack of politics for an assessment of the conditions for validity claims.\(^\text{19}\) For how should we capture/conceive of knowledge in cultures that use explanatory strategies different from our own or where such strategies are not accessible to us? To give an example from one of the projects assembled here: the knowledge of conjuration rituals is a kind of knowledge that does not conform to Platonic ideas about truth and truth claims,\(^\text{20}\) but it does lie within the confines of what constitutes rational knowledge\(^\text{21}\) in the sense that its principles are the effectiveness of magical actions. In the area of tacit knowing, the Platonic idea of knowledge cannot be applied at all.

In consequence, discursively formulated truth claims can be expressed in various forms – for instance as a socially accepted practice, aesthetic representation, etc. In each case, the concept of knowledge on which they are based should therefore admit specific explanatory acts and, accordingly, pluralistic explanatory strategies as well. These extend to complete recursivity and the seemingly paradoxical claim that something “is being done because it is done”; this is the rationality of communicative action, in which the means and the ends of practices are identical. In non-modern societies, including those of ancient Greece, precisely this kind of action played a substantially more significant role than it does today.\(^\text{22}\)

The conclusion to be drawn from all of this is that we are not dealing with one form of culture of knowledge, but with many, since what is considered to be true in one case cannot be regarded in isolation from contexts and power relationships based on a historically situated culture of knowledge.\(^\text{23}\)

---

16 A detailed example of this is given in van Dyke 2008. Sanders 1992 is excellent from a methodical point of view.
17 Jay 2002.
18 See for the dispute over Habermas’ “ideal speech situation” Cooren 2000.
20 A central element in this is Plato’s proposal to define knowledge as a true and justified opinion (Plat. *Tht*. 200d–210b). He then, however, goes on to reject this (Plat. *Tht*. 209d4–210a1) in favor of a definition as a noetic insight into the connections of essential thinking (cf. exemplarily Plat. *Pol*. 511b–c). On the classical concept of knowledge, see Aristotle (*Analytica posterioria*; *Ethica Nicomachea*; *Metaphysics*) and Plato (*Menon*; *Politieia*; *Theaititos*); cf. also Hardy and Meier-Oeser 2004; Rapp and Wagner 2006.
21 Evans-Pritchard 1937.
22 On this, see Habermas 1987, 377–389; on the Greek *praxis* – *poiesis* divide, see for example Agamben 1999, 68–93.
3.2 Space

The problem is not so much that space means very different things [...] but that it is used with such abandon that its meanings run into each other before they have been properly interrogated.  

It is with these critical words that the British cultural geographers Mike Crang and Nigel Thrift introduce their much-cited anthology *Thinking Space*. They emphasize different conceptions of space, their backgrounds and respective analytical possibilities. Our research projects all rest on the conviction that space is dynamically present rather than statically existent. We investigate the production of spatiality and spatial difference in and through discourses and practices. Spatial production in this sense refers to not only the emergence, but also the consolidation, transformation and renewed dissolution of space and spatial references. Space and spatiality are not to be conceptualized as a container. Instead, our focus is on relational networks, interactional spaces and geo-referencing, but also on spatial transformations, e.g. of areas of control which are transformed from associations of people to territorial entities or by past globalization and regionalization processes. One of our aims is to critically reflect on *cultural containers* such as ‘Romans’ and ‘Germanic tribes’, which have had an enormous impact on the history of research. We re-evaluate these concepts by analyzing local uses of objects that had been produced in other places. The same is true for spaces which figure in historiographic narratives as ‘predestined’ areas of origin of particular peoples. Space, used as an *explanans* in treatises of societies, cultures and identities is turned into an *explanandum*. Following the French sociologist Henri Lefebvre, spatiality is understood as a process with three modes of production which mutually influence and determine each other.

Lefebvre sets great store by a dialectics of the spatial which he perceived as predominantly social. He writes: “(Social) space is not a thing among other things, nor a product among other products: rather, it subsumes things produced, and encompasses their interrelationships in their coexistence and simultaneity – their (relative) order and/or (relative) disorder.” The three spatialities are (1) the perceived and experienced (materialized) space – *espace perçu* – as the product of a spatial reference necessarily present in all actions; action refers to spatialities previously present, but also reproduces these. This area encompasses the largely predictable behavior of subjects in familiar spaces (e.g. a lecture theater, a bus, a kitchen). (2) The conceived space – *espace conçu* – is the representation of space in the form of codes, signs, maps, texts and discourses. The Excellence Cluster *Topoi* can and will probably become unintentionally or deliberately a part of Lefebvre’s *espace conçu*, which is at all times “pervaded with relative and changing knowledge (a mixture of insight and ideology).” (3) The lived space – *espace vécu* –, whose representation has its origin in history and is the product of complex ascriptions of meaning and symbolizations by its inhabitants and their social relationships. Edward Soja has focused on Lefebvre’s lived space, now called *Thirdspace* (Fig. 3). He conceives it as a dialectic combination of *Firstspace* and *Secondspace* that is of special importance for the modes of subaltern production of space. The interdependence of space (as practiced and experienced by the senses) and power became an important research field. For instance, in the analysis

---

24 Crang and Thrift 2000, 1.
25 See for example Langthaler 2013, 4.
26 Lefebvre 1997 [1974].
27 Lefebvre 1997 [1974], 73.
28 Lefebvre 2006, 339.
29 Soja 1996; Soja 1999; Bhambra and Rutherford 1999.
30 See Bellina and Michel 2007; Münken 2012; Fuller and Michel 2012.
of built space, the principles of verticality and visibility, the production of social space as a habitualized form of practice\textsuperscript{31} play an important part here.

![Diagram of the trialectics of spatiality](image)

**Fig. 3 |** The trialectics of spatiality.

The present-oriented trialectics, which emphasizes the social constitution of the spatial and takes into account the role of space in the emergence of social relationships,\textsuperscript{32} must be historicized by understanding the production of space as a repeated reacquisition, transformation of and reference to various \textit{espaces reçus} – received spaces and their representations.\textsuperscript{33} By following these lines, identity-constituting memorial sites, cultural heritage or spatial representations, for example on coins, can be understood more clearly. An identity space is a space or \textit{scape} of a collective identity, something that is continuously being reproduced. This social space is perceived, represented or lived by the identity group itself and/or by other individuals and groups, with reference always being made to former spaces, be it in acquisition or dissociation. The production of such a space is at the same time constitutive of identities and alterities.

Even if we follow a relational understanding of space, we should not neglect the formation of container spaces.\textsuperscript{34} For example, Neolithization can be conceived as a process of ‘containerizing’ with the innovations of house, pottery and similar containers, which determine our material lives even today. Furthermore, container space concepts are still dominant today and have their own repercussions for human practice: they produce specific kinds of spaces, which in turn affect the perception of and thinking about spaces. This can, among other things, lead to the marginalization of so-called minorities and is not infrequently accompanied by essentializations of collective identities. For us, it is

\begin{itemize}
\item[31] Bourdieu 1991; Bernbeck (in press)
\item[33] Cf. Hofmann 2014/2015
\item[34] Langthaler 2015, 3–4.
\end{itemize}
important to examine the plurality of differing space concepts and their interaction, partly in order to achieve greater reflexivity about spatial practices and semantics.\textsuperscript{35}

\subsection*{3.3 Identity}

The search for identities has played an important role in ancient studies ever since its beginnings.\textsuperscript{36} Two key questions – Who am I/are we? Where do I/we come from? – are linked with a claim to the recognition of one’s own aims and desires which is usually directed at the future. For ancient studies this also involves the research pragmatics of how we can use the material, pictorial and written records to come up with hypotheses about historical actors, who are then transformed\textsuperscript{37} into characters in factual narratives (e.g. historiography).\textsuperscript{38} The powerful semantic innovation “identity”\textsuperscript{39} has only become established in ancient studies since the 1990s as a more or less reflected term.\textsuperscript{40} In its current academic and colloquial vagueness,\textsuperscript{41} it is mainly used as an \textit{umbrella term} for everything that relates to the “point of suture”\textsuperscript{42} of individual and collective or society,\textsuperscript{43} i.e. for self- and personhood, social roles, different kinds of communities and institutions. Identity-related research is not (only) the search for identities, but also the analysis of ancient sources with regard to the question which specific entities can be subsumed at all under this term. At the same time, the explanatory ranges of the underlying concepts and theories are examined and put in relation to alternative concepts, e.g. subjectivation, singularity or multitude.\textsuperscript{44}

Identity in the narrower sense of the term is understood as a dynamic and a “fragile unity of its constituent, diachronic and synchronic differences.”\textsuperscript{45} It is only through subjects and/or groups that distance themselves from others and create relationships of difference and sameness, that these differences exist.\textsuperscript{46} For this reason, they can also be described as a “synthesis of the heterogeneous.”\textsuperscript{47} The process-related construction of identities is based on an interaction between inclusion and exclusion and is accompanied by the emergence of alterities – dissimilarities that remain understandable in relation to a self and therefore ‘translatable’ – and the dissociation from alienity as a ‘radical alterity’ (Fig. 4). The resultant boundaries between identities, alterities and alienities can vary greatly.\textsuperscript{48} They depend on situational perception and evaluation of differences in the attribution of qualities to oneself and others.\textsuperscript{49} Thus, identity comprises both “sameness” and “difference”: a “belonging to / being similar to,” on the one hand, and a “being special / contrasting with,” on the other hand.\textsuperscript{50} In addition to an image of the self, a discursive

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{35} Schroer\textsuperscript{2003}; Schroer\textsuperscript{2008}; Schlottmann\textsuperscript{2005}.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Gardner\textsuperscript{2011}, 11.
\item \textsuperscript{37} See Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum and Felix Wiedemann: “Historische Variablen und narrative Identität. Überlegungen zur historiographischen Namensgebung in den Altertumswissenschaften.” In preparation.
\item \textsuperscript{38} See Genette\textsuperscript{1990}.
\item \textsuperscript{39} Reckwitz\textsuperscript{2001}.
\item \textsuperscript{40} See Pitts\textsuperscript{2007}.
\item \textsuperscript{41} For a critical view of this, see Brubaker and Cooper\textsuperscript{2000}.
\item \textsuperscript{42} Hall\textsuperscript{1996}, 5–6.
\item \textsuperscript{43} Jenkins\textsuperscript{2000}, 15.
\item \textsuperscript{44} Bernbeck\textsuperscript{2012}.
\item \textsuperscript{45} Straub\textsuperscript{2002}, 353, originally: “fragile Einheit ihrer konstitutiven, diachronen und synchronen Differenzen.”
\item \textsuperscript{46} Barth\textsuperscript{1969}.
\item \textsuperscript{47} Ricœur\textsuperscript{1988}, 106. See also Straub\textsuperscript{2012}.
\item \textsuperscript{48} Particularly in projects B-4-4 and B-4-5, the duality logic between identity and alterity is resolved in a similar way by adding third elements and approaches.
\item \textsuperscript{49} Hofmann\textsuperscript{2012}.
\item \textsuperscript{50} Byron\textsuperscript{1998}.
\end{itemize}
articulation of the understanding of others is a necessary prerequisite for the constitution of any identity.

At the forefront of our interest are the constitution, establishment and change of collective identities. Researchers frequently cite shared characteristics, historical continuity and coherence in everyday life when discussing this. Thus, internally, collective identities consist of naming practices, scenarios and representations, naturalizations and (de-)historicizations. Scholars also often make reference to language, religion and rituals, material culture, geography or landscape features. Not infrequently, stereotypes arise in connection with such approaches. However, it must not be forgotten that collective identities are orders of (giving) meaning and exist solely to the extent that human beings place themselves in relation to them.\(^\text{51}\)

Identity-related research on ancient societies is generally driven by an empirical-reconstructive procedure that is based on fragmentary records and has been referred to as the “culture historical approach”.\(^\text{52}\) Thus, artifacts, the combinations in which they occur, and written sources are classified on the basis of similarities and assigned to space-time units. To make it easy to distinguish among them, the terms used are often based on modern place names, supposedly neutral geographical regions, or on the names of cities, regions and groups of people in ancient written sources. In this process, various characteristics, such as styles, formal types, cultural practices, but also ritual ‘schools’ or specific groups of ritual texts, or whole technological complexes are subsumed under one name and conceptualized as internally coherent. In a second step, such terminologies are related to each other, often equated and merged as cultural expressions of one group of people or even of an alleged historical identity. Despite their partly contradictory and polythetic nature, these entities easily transform in scholarly discourse into hugely influential constructs that are almost impossible to challenge. In the end, the resultant

\(^\text{52}\) E.g. Trigger 2006, 211–313.
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'historical' entities are transformed into collective actors\(^{53}\) and narrativized identities\(^{54}\) in our historiographic accounts. However, when compared to modern times, these (re)constructed identities have a rather static and essentialist character due to a low degree of temporal resolution and minimal information density. Moreover, methodological nationalism\(^{55}\) and the widespread practice of mapping\(^{56}\) have led to notions of territorially based collective identities. For a more appropriate research of identities in ancient studies, it is urgently necessary to revisit these quasi-automatic processes, and to query the status and background of such historiographical categories.\(^{57}\) Instead of drawing conclusions founded on presence/absence mapping, we need to take a closer look at the social and cultural contexts, since the distribution of objects, practices and ideas generally have widely variable effects on people. For instance, regionally distinct conjuration rituals reflect merely variable orders of meaning that can have emerged both from regionalization attempts and from pre-existing regional collectivities with a specific universe of common values. For the manifold ancient societies, it is therefore important to examine which abstract concepts of identity are applicable in this field and how the specific observations can be brought into line with multifarious forms of group cohesion. Instead of hastily assigning identities and yielding to the customary preference for unambiguous interpretations, we aim to demonstrate alternative possibilities of interpretation.

4 Case studies

4.1 The ritual compositions from Kizzuwatna – an example of the regionalization of ‘global’ knowledge

The Hittite ritual compositions possess two noteworthy features. On the one hand, all ritual texts show a common structure on the basis of which the ritual is orchestrated and performed. On the other hand, it is possible to observe in these texts elements that can be identified as deriving from different (largely regional) traditions, such as Hurrian (or Mesopotamian), Kizzuwatnean, Arzawean or Luwian traditions. This feature has been interpreted in a number of different ways.

The existence of different cultural strata in this textual genre results from a process of ‘acculturation’,\(^{58}\) a process that led Hans Gustav Güterbock to the very definition of ‘Hittite Civilization’ that we would advocate. He observed that the so-called ‘culture’ of the Hittite state was in itself the result of the combination of different cultural layers, each originating from a different cultural milieu. This process of ‘acculturation’ started before the time of the first known Hittite king, Hattusili I (16th century BC), and continued, almost without a break, throughout the entire existence of the Hittite kingdom.\(^{59}\)

Further studies have tried to investigate the possibility of distinguishing these different cultural traditions. The modification of the way in which Güterbock defined these dif-

---

\(^{53}\) On the dissolution of the traditional understanding of past actors and its broadening by using non-human material-semiotic actors, see Schreiber\(^{2016}\).

\(^{54}\) Ricœur\(^{1991}\).

\(^{55}\) Beck\(^{1997}\), 115–116; Wimmer and Glick Schiller\(^{2002}\), Glick Schiller\(^{2010}\).

\(^{56}\) Discussed, among other things, as part of the workshop Mapping Ancient Identities; see http://www.topoi.org/event/22138/ (visited on 04/05/2016).

\(^{57}\) See for example Hofmann\(^{2014}\).

\(^{58}\) For definitions of the concept of ‘acculturation’ in fields of research which are not strictly related to Hittitology, see Gotter\(^{2000}\) and Hofmann\(^{2014}\).

\(^{59}\) Güterbock\(^{1957}\), 234: “Hittite Civilization ‘…’ is a mixed culture and cannot in its entirety be ascribed to a single ethnic group.”
ferent cultural layers (‘Kultschichten’\textsuperscript{60}) has been an important step in this direction, taken initially in the work of Annelies Kammenhuber,\textsuperscript{61} but more substantially demonstrated – specifically in reference to foreign traditions – by Jörg Klinger.\textsuperscript{62} Along much the same lines, Klinger has also highlighted the ‘cultural nature’ of the hethitische Kultschicht.\textsuperscript{63}

This project will focus on implementing a trialetics between ‘knowledge,’ ‘space’ and ‘identity’ in the understanding of this process of ‘acculturation!’ Although the construct ‘knowledge’ has the prominent position, the other two elements play an important role in this process as well. By analyzing local motifs which belong to a specific tradition, we seek to explain how these social constructs can be used to identify a specific cultural stratum (local dimension) and to determine, briefly, its relation with the main ritual text tradition (global dimension).

The structure of Hittite ritual texts

Before analyzing those features that might be explained as an elaboration of a local tradition, it is important to make clear how the Hittite ritual compositions, as a special kind of textual genre, are organized. In the following generalized reconstruction the main features of a ‘typical’ Hittite ritual text composition are illustrated. It should be considered that similarities in the generic structure are present not only in those parts that are more literary in character, such as the incipit and the colophon, but to some degree also in those parts which focus on the ritual actions themselves.

The majority of the ritual texts are framed by two components – the first is called the incipit, an introductory part, and the second, concluding part is called the colophon. These two elements provide us with the most relevant information in terms of the literary character of the composition. Here we can find, for instance, ‘personal’ information on the ‘author’ – the person to whom the magical manipulations are ascribed –, the purpose of the ritual, or details about the composition itself such as the number of tablets in which it is recorded (and the position of an individual tablet in that sequence), the condition of the original tablet from which it was copied, or the name of the scribe who composed or copied the text.

Between these two framing elements, we find a description of the ritual actions, which starts with a ‘list of the paraphernalia,’ an enumeration of materials, tools or objects employed during the ritual. Then a record of the magic practices that are to be carried out follows, usually accompanied by recitations or speech acts. They are performed by the main practitioner and the client, called the ‘ritual patron’ in the text, sometimes with the aid of other participants or specialists.\textsuperscript{64}

\textsuperscript{60}The German word Kultschicht has been translated (sometimes improperly) in English secondary literature as both ‘cultic layer’ and ‘cultural layer,’ depending on the final intention and interpretation of the author. The topic would require a wider digression, which is not the goal of this contribution. However, it can be observed that the ‘cultural layer’ definition is usually preferred when ritual compositions are investigated (see for example Miller \textsuperscript{2224} 442: 454). For that reason, the translation ‘cultural layer’ has been preferred in the present contribution.

\textsuperscript{61}Kammenhuber \textsuperscript{1971} Kammenhuber \textsuperscript{1972}

\textsuperscript{62}Klinger \textsuperscript{1996}

\textsuperscript{63}Klinger \textsuperscript{1996} esp. 6–16. A different view is taken by Kammenhuber \textsuperscript{1971} Kammenhuber \textsuperscript{1972}

\textsuperscript{64}In several manuscripts, these manipulations possess a tripartite structure, as has already been pointed out by Szabo \textsuperscript{1971} table on p. 108. She identifies the following elements: physical ‘manipulation,’ analogy magic, and ‘oral magic’ (Handlung, Analogiezauber, Sagen). Another scholar, D.P. Wright, has classified these manipulations, identifying, on a theoretical level, ten Hittite ‘magic practices’: the practices of transfer, detergent, substitution, entreaty and appeasement, analogy, concretizing, annulment, disposal, prevention, invigoration (see Wright \textsuperscript{1987} 31–45 for their definition). He calls them “purification motifs,” emphasizing in this way their final aim of restoring a former state of purity.
How to ascribe a ritual text to a local tradition

Now it is possible to proceed with a discussion of the second noteworthy feature of the Hittite rituals, namely those references that may designate different ritual traditions coming from both inside and outside the territories controlled by the Hittite kingdom. These traditions can be understood, theoretically, as conditions for the identification of cultural ‘identities’ each provided with specific features and connected with a local body of knowledge. Furthermore, these identities find expression in the figure of the ‘author’. The possibly fictional nature of this figure, although important, is not relevant to the aims of this contribution and will not be dealt with here.

The ritual compositions provide us with several references or clues, which were identified by a number of scholars as typical ritual motifs and cultural traits of a specific local or regional tradition. This identification was then used to ascribe other texts which exhibit some of these characteristic features to one of the ritual traditions. Although the majority of these attributions is theoretically plausible, the identification of ritual motifs and cultural traits with local traditions is not always beyond doubt. The result of these ascriptions is the classification of the ritual compositions into two groups. The first group is made up of those texts whose ascription has been determined on the basis of explicit statements of the Hittite scribes themselves, whereas the ascription for the second group is based on the interpretations of modern scholars. We will now illustrate the method used for these interpretations, using some ritual texts that are usually connected with the tradition of Kizzuwatna.

a. Either in the incipit or in the colophon, one can find some spatial references which are connected with the author of the ritual practices. This geographical information, provided to us by the Hittite scribes themselves, concerns mainly the place of origin: a known city, a geographical region, a political unit or even a temple, when the author is a priest or priestess. These toponyms have been interpreted as the ‘cultural background’ of this figure, the places where the author was trained in the ritual practices.

The kingdom of Kizzuwatna is mentioned as the homeland of the priest of Išara Ammiḥatna (CTH 471), the ‘woman’ (MUNUS) Maštigga (CTH 404), and the doctor Zarpīya (CTH 757). The city Kummani, however, is the origin of the purapist priests Ammiḥatna, Tulpī and Mati, the authors of a ritual (CTH 472), of Kuwanni, the ‘woman’ who was connected with the temple of Hepat of Kummani (CTH 474), and of the patili priest Papanikri (CTH 476). Moreover, it is also attested as the origin of Maštigga in some versions of her ritual (CTH 404).

On the basis of these two groups of texts, we can easily assume that any reference to the city of Kummani implies a cultural connection with the traditions of the kingdom of Kizzuwatna, since both geographical names are associated with the same authors, for instance, in the different versions of the rituals ascribed to Ammiḥatna and Maštigga. The geographical reference situates these texts within a specific cultural and religious milieu shaped by various influences, such as the older Kizzuwatnean tradition as well as Luwian
and Hurrian elements, etc.\(^{66}\) This can be seen as an example of how knowledge can be “emplaced and localised.”\(^{67}\)

It is definitely less common to find similar information in the core of the texts. Some compositions clearly refer to a separate tablet which contains a specific incantation. Sometimes they also mention the place where a particular tablet was collected. For example, in the birth ritual CTH 489.A (KBo 17.65++, reverse, lines 45–46), we find the mention of a Kizzuwatnaean tablet which is reported to explain how to celebrate the ‘festival of birth.’ Other texts mention different ways of performing a specific ritual. In the oracle KUB 5.6+ (CTH 570, iii 24–26, 35–36), the ritual *mantalli* can be performed either according to the ‘way of Arzawa’ or the ‘way of Ḥatti.’

b. Other types of references have been used by modern scholars to ascribe a manuscript to a particular tradition, quite different elements which can be observed in the main part of the compositions, more specifically in the descriptions of the ritual manipulations.

A first group of indices is connected with the use of foreign, i.e. non-Hittite languages, within the text. This can be the case with both isolated linguistic elements – for instance, specific ritual terms, names of objects or materials – and so-called incantations or recitations entirely expressed in a different language, such as Hittian, Luwian, Hurrian, etc. For example, in the ritual of Tunnawi (CTH 490), the ‘old woman’ recites an incantation entirely in Luwian (KUB 7.53, I 57–59). Sometimes the foreign language is identified through the use of an adverb – such as *luwili* - ‘in Luwian’, *hattili* - ‘in Hattic’, *hurlili* - ‘in Hurrian’ – before the text of the incantation. The text for the ritual of Ammiḫatna (CTH 471), says that the divination priest (*AZU*), an assistant to the main practitioner, should recite an incantation in Hurrian. In one passage, the Hurrian incantation follows immediately (KBo 5.2, ii 21–27), whereas in other passages it is entirely omitted (KBo 5.2, iii 38; 53).

A second group of indications consists of references to deities connected to specific local *panthea*, especially when these deities play an important role in the rites. Hurrian and Luwian gods are often mentioned in Kizzuwatnaean rituals, for example. In the ritual of Pilliya (CTH 475), who is described as king of either Kizzuwatna or Kummani in the *incipits* of the two versions of the ritual, a passage describes the ritual offering to several deities connected with the Hurrian pantheon: Ḥepat, Ḥalki, Ḫuten and Ḫutellura, alongside the Mesopotamian god Ea (KUB 7.20, ii 8, 14–15). In the ritual of Zarpiya (CTH 757), the ‘doctor’ from Kizzuwatna, we find Luwian gods both in the Hittite part of the text and in the Luwian one: the Innarawanta deities in the Hittite part of the text and in the Luwian one: the Innarawanta deities in the Hittite part (HT 1, obv. 29’); Santa, the Annarummanzi deities (KUB 9.31, ii 22–28) and the Luwian sun-deity Tiwaz (HT 1, rev. 6’) in the Luwian passages.

A third group of indices mentions geographical names and natural elements during the description of ritual manipulations, such as cities, shrines, springs, rivers or mountains. An example of this group can be found in the ritual of Pilliya (CTH 475). The water of the seven springs of the Kizzuwatnaean city of Lawazzantiya (KBo 9.119+, i 35’–40’) is

\(^{66}\) It is also well known that in other cases the use of two different places of origin for the same author is not so easy to explain as in the case of the ritual of the ‘woman’ named Zuwi (CTH 412). The text itself does not show any traits connected with Kizzuwatna. Some versions of her ritual claim that she came from Durmitta, while others mention Angulluwa. The two names maybe refer to the region and the city respectively (Giorgeri 1988; Forlanini 1979; Forlanini 1985). The examples discussed previously, namely the rituals of Ammiḫatna, Mastigga and Zuwi, offer a possible solution to the problem of the attestation of different toponyms for one author. Unfortunately this explanation is not always possible for other ritual compositions. This, together with the occasional lack of correspondence between the author and the main practitioner, has led some scholars to doubt the ‘ethnographical intention’ of the Hittite scribes in recording the name of the real author of the composition.

\(^{67}\) Crang and Thrift 2000, 2–3.
used to create the ‘water of purity’. This ritual substance is a typical feature of rituals from Kizzuwatna.

Finally, a fourth group of indications concerns those ritual manipulations which clearly seem to have a relation to a specific local tradition, such as the ritual manipulations connected with the ‘water of purity’ just mentioned. These manipulations are only described within the Kizzuwatnean rituals, such as the ritual of Ammihiatna (CTH 471) or the purification ritual CTH 446. Moreover, the term which refers to this water (šehelliya(s) wātar/widār,68 ‘water of purity’, ‘pure water’) is the product of a mixed Hurrian-Luwian scribal school. The whole term is Luwian in origin, but the first word (šehl- ‘pure’).

c. A consideration of all these different features allows interesting observations to be made and leads us to several conclusions. We find ritual descriptions which show both Hurrian and Luwian features among the compositions from Kizzuwatna. Some manuscripts, such as those rituals that make use of the ‘water of purity’, show a combination of elements, whereas others show a clear predominance of one of the two cultural traditions, e.g. in the ritual ascribed to the priest Ammihiatna (CTH 471), where offerings to Hurrian deities (iii 3–20) are mentioned alongside recitations in Hurrian. Another example is the ritual of Zarpiya (CTH 757): although he also hailed from Kizzuwatna, the deities mentioned in his ritual belong to the Luwian pantheon and the recitations are also recorded in the Luwian language.

In conclusion, at the end of this brief analysis, we can see that ritual compositions can be investigated by using the three social constructs ‘knowledge’, ‘space’ and ‘identity’. These documents transmit a type of ‘knowledge’ that we have defined here as ‘ritual tradition’. This knowledge, like every form of ‘discursive knowledge’, requires active agents who can verify its ‘truthfulness’ in what can be defined as ‘processes of mediation’ that legitimate its values and allow their transmission. These agents can be seen as a community and more specifically a collective group that shares the same ritual tradition. Unfortunately, the Hittite texts do not provide us with any further information about the identity of these agents of community, who remain largely unknown to us.

This is where the trialectics comes to our aid. Since each social construct internalizes and takes on meaning through others, we can use ‘space’ and ‘knowledge’ to provide the missing conceptual apparatus. The ‘identity’ – or rather the ‘cultural identity’ since it is being investigated primarily on the cultural level – can be connected with the two constructs ‘space’ (the representation of the places [space] where these traditions have been generated, the espace conçu of Lefebvre) and ‘knowledge’ (the ritual traditions). Their mutual interaction produces what can be defined as a cultural stratum (or Kultschicht) in the text and, ultimately, the ‘author’ of the composition can be seen as an anthropomorphic manifestation of this stratum.

4.2 The coin hoard of Krest – coins as mediators of knowledge about space and identity69

Coins are the key to an interesting insight into “identityscapes”70 i.e. the social space where the collective identity is continuously constructed. It contains the characteristics that make identity and alterities recognizable.

68 See Wegner 2000, 45–46 and fn. 54; and Haas 2007, 146–153.
69 We would like to express our gratitude to our colleagues at the Regional Historical Museum of Haskovo for providing us with access to the numismatic material in their collection. The inventory numbers cited below are based on the classification used by the museum.
70 Kemmers and Myrberg 2011, 89.
The coin, as a material object, has a surface (space with image and inscription) and physical characteristics (material, measurements etc.) that indicate the knowledge, space and identity of the issuing authority. In addition to revealing the basic information about the designs of the coins, it also indicates the necessary level of previous knowledge which made the image and the legend comprehensible. The way the message of the coin was understood most probably varied, but it is obvious that the depictions were not chosen randomly. This choice and the minting itself relate to the primary context of the coin, while the use, the reception of the coin die, the understanding and possible reuse are the secondary context, and the deposition is the tertiary context.\textsuperscript{71}

A coin hoard presents ample opportunity for the exploration of the different context levels. Some coins minted in the cities of interest to project B-4-2 – Pautalia and Philippopolis\textsuperscript{72} – are part of a hoard which was chanced upon in 1963. Found in a small ceramic pot, the hoard was deposited in the ground in the vicinity of the present-day Bulgarian village of Krepost, in the region of Haskovo (Fig. 5). The hoard consisted of 190 bronze


coins from the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD. All are of a large denomination and well preserved. The earliest coin is of Faustina Major (AD 138–161) and the latest are those of Philip the Arab and his wife (AD 244–249). There is only one imperial issue, one single coin from the neighboring province of Lower Moesia and three coins from different parts of Asia Minor. The overwhelming majority was struck in cities in Thrace (166 coins; see Tab. 1). The mints of Pautalia, Serdica and Philippopolis are strongly represented, with more than 85% of the inventoried coins. The hoard was deposited near via Diagonalis, a very important Roman road in the region that runs from Singidunum to Byzantium, passing through Serdica, Philippopolis and Hadrianopolis, which was also connected to Pautalia via a secondary road. The fact that the coins were found outside the territory of the issuing cities, and some even outside the province of origin might illustrate the circulation of the provincial coins on a higher level than merely an internal city market. Thus the hoard probably denotes the economic space on a regional and local scale. The fact that the majority of coins in the find were minted in different Thracian cities under the Severan dynasty could suggest that, at least in this period, coins were able to circulate and also be used as a means of payment at some distance from the city of origin. For instance, in the current case, Pautalia and Serdica are c. 300 km away from the place of discovery.

73 Gerov 1977, 163 – coin hoard no. 196. For the latest interpretation of the hoard see Komnick 2003, 34 no. 11 with further notes. For the purposes of this case study, the coin distribution list by Jurukova 1976, 193–194, was used, as it updates the one employed by Gerassimov 1965, 248–249. There are some inconsistencies in her analysis, but they do not affect the observations in the present work. 171 coins became part of the numismatic collection of the Regional Historical Museum of Haskovo. The percentages in the text are calculated on the basis of only these coins.

74 Jurukova 1976, 214.

75 The period represented is long, but not uncommon in a coin hoard.

76 Jurukova 1976, 194.


78 These individual specimens could have been included by chance because they are the same denomination size. They do not represent the main currency in circulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pautalia (63)</td>
<td>Thracia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serdica (61)</td>
<td>Thracia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippopolis (22)</td>
<td>Thracia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Traiana (13)</td>
<td>Thracia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicopolis ad Nestum (3)</td>
<td>Thracia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deultum (2)</td>
<td>Thracia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzia (1)</td>
<td>Thracia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traianopolis (1)</td>
<td>Thracia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicopolis ad Istrum (1)</td>
<td>Moesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalcedon (1)</td>
<td>Bithynia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicæa (1)</td>
<td>Bithynia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancyra (1)</td>
<td>Galatia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 1 | Coin distribution (based on Jurukova 1976).
Judging by the latest issues in the coin hoard, it was most probably deposited in the middle of the 3rd century AD in the context of the incursions of trans-Danubian tribes, probably at the end of the rule of Philip the Arab. More than 130 coin hoards deposited in this period (AD 244–249) are attested for the region of the Balkans. Hence they could probably indicate the space (Ereignisraum or space of action; Angstraum or space of threat and fear) which was threatened by the Gothic invasions and which thus became the place where the hoards were deposited. The finds could also point to the route of the incursions, as the inhabitants of the territory in question reacted similarly to the danger.

As has been previously mentioned, the Severan issues are the best represented in the hoard. In total, 162 pieces, c. 95% of the coins in the find, date to the Severan dynasty, with Septimius Severus (AD 193–211) and Julia Domna as well as their sons Caracalla (AD 205–217) and Geta (AD 208–211) and the Emperor Elagabalus (AD 218–222) (Table 1). This is in accordance with the attested economic prosperity and strong increase in issues by the Thracian cities during the Severan period. In Thrace, this is especially valid for the Caracalla period, as the hoard shows.

The analysis of some specimens illustrates how the types might be interpreted as expressions of the trialectics of knowledge, space and identity. Religion has a decisive meaning for the genesis and preservation of cultural identity. Thus its symbols were the most common expression of identity on the coins – naturally of that of the polis elite. This is also evident in the Krepost Hoard, since religious imagery strongly prevails on the reverse (as was customary, the obverse shows the Roman emperor).

For Pautalia and Philippopolis, there are images of the well-known deities of the Greek-Roman pantheon (e.g. Zeus, Athena, Hermes, Heracles, Demeter, Hera, Dionysus, Ares and Sarapis). We also find issues with images of great local significance. The types with Asclepius, Hygieia and a snake represent the cult of the health gods and are the most common in the hoard. This cult was very popular in the province of Thrace and especially in Pautalia. The hoard also contains some coin types very unusual for the cult, but common for the city, mirroring the medical activity there; for instance, one shows a flying snake with Asclepius. The type that depicts Asclepius in front of a temple (Fig. 6), which is attested by several specimens from the Caracalla issues, is also important. It indicates not simply the religious space, but probably an element of the city’s architecture, as human-made places were also featured in coin dies. Although the limited surface area of the coin often resulted in highly schematic designs, the depictions can be considered, with the support of other types of sources, as evidence that Asclepius was honored as one of the main deities of Pautalia in a temple.

80 Most of the scholars date the first wave of the Gothic incursions of the period AD 248–251 in Lower Moesia and Thrace in AD 248, in the last years of the reign of Philip the Arab (see Dimitrov 2005; Boteva 2005, Gerov 1963). For a different view see V. Varbanov 2012. Touratsoglou 2006, 188, dates the hoard of the village of Krepost to the time of Philip the Arab.


82 Komnick 2003, 37–38 rightly argued that it is less probable that the hoard could have belonged to a Roman soldier on his way through Thrace to Asia Minor and back, as Jurukova 1981, 42 supposed. Jurukova may have argued along these lines because of the smaller quantity of coins from the nearest poleis which minted coins (namely Philippopolis, Augusta Traiana and Traianopolis) to the place of discovery.

83 Boteva 1997.

84 Inv. nos. H-214/2 and H-216/A3.

85 Inv. no. 217/G3; Pautalia_CNT_4440, in: Corpus Nummorum Thraceorum, http://www.corpus-nummorum.eu/CNT_4440 (visited on 02/08/2016); Jurukova 1976, 205, no. 34.

86 Inv. nos. H-217/F3 and T4.

87 Katsarova 2012, 276–277.
The main deity of Philippopolis was Apollon – Apollon Kendrisos, to be precise.\[88\] The epithet has clearly a Thracian origin; Apollon was actually merged with a similar Thracian deity. On a coin from Philippopolis in the hoard, minted under Emperor Elagabalus, Apollon Citharoede can be seen on the reverse (Fig. 7).\[89\] The coin legend ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΕΩΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΠΟΛΕΩΣ // ΝΕΟΚΟΡΟΣ on the one hand marks the status of the city as a metropolis – the most important city in the province.\[90\] On the other hand, the legend contains the title neokoros, temple warden, which meant that Philippopolis was awarded the right to celebrate the imperial cult.\[91\] As other coin images attest, there were also games dedicated to the imperial cult. These Pythian Games were given the epithet

---

90 Howgego 2005, 11 comments on this as an expression of the “Roman geography of power” in the local coinage.
Kendreseia, meaning that they were linked to the local deity Kendrisos. The honors and highly esteemed titles granted to the cities by the emperor also represented the identity of the polis and were celebrated on the city’s coinage. These are important aspects of self-representation on the part of the city; by promoting them the city sought to express itself and to underline its advantages in comparison to other cities. They symbolized and reinforced the self-image of the polis, which derived from its individuality, its distinction amongst other cities and the characteristics of its autonomy (even if it was very limited).

As has been stated above, the coin images were meant for special target groups. Thus they were understood, because the recipients possessed the required knowledge.

Furthermore, the coin types of the two cities with river gods on the reverse are very significant. The personification of the river can be interpreted as a representation of the geographical space. In the Krepost Hoard, there is one such coin issued under Caracalla and one under Elagabalus, both from Philippopolis (Fig. 8). In both cases, the river god is leaning on the stern of a ship. This – together with other sources – implies that the River Hebros (today Marica), the largest river in Thrace and the one on which Philippopolis was situated, was navigable in ancient times. Hence the surroundings were also mirrored on the coins. In Pautalia and the entire surrounding region, the River Strymon was very important economically, which was clearly reflected in a special city cult in its honor. Its personification as the river god was depicted on coins from the city minted under Caracalla, Plautilla and Geta (Fig. 9).

---

92 Elkins 2009, 44, 46. Another example are the coins minted in connection with games in honor of the Thracian Koinon, which were also issued in Philippopolis. They did not propagate local types, but had designs intelligible in the broader context of the province (see Peter 2013, 116).

93 Inv. no. H-235/2, not cited by Jurukova 1976.


95 Peter 2005a with further evidence.


97 Inv. no. H-217/12.

98 Inv. no. H-215/2.

The analysis of a coin hoard becomes even more illuminating when put in the broader numismatic context of the period and correlated to other finds. The comparison of the Krepost Hoard with a find from the territory of the neighboring province of Moesia Inferior supports some of the observations already made, for instance the coin hoard from the village of Belintsi, in the region of Razgrad (near the ancient town of Abritus)\textsuperscript{100} (Fig. 5). The variety of types in the Belintsi find is very similar, with predominantly religious depictions. Again, the Severan dynasty is the one most frequently represented by the coins. The latest coins are of Gordian III and his wife Tranquillina (AD 241–244), which indicates the same period of unrest in the mid-3rd century AD. As with Krepost, the coins are of large denomination. This could support the hypotheses that primarily the higher denominations were circulating outside the city of origin\textsuperscript{101} and, of course only those with larger value were worth hoarding.

In all these cases, the coins reflect the espace conçu\textsuperscript{102} of the polis in their images. At the same time, they were not only a statement of the identity of the polis elites, but also mediated and reflected the knowledge – the knowledge about the topography of the city, the specific features of the landscape, the Roman rule, the local pantheon, the cultural memory – which was handed down through generations, as the myths symbolized on the coins demonstrate. Thus they were also an expression of the espaces reçus\textsuperscript{103}.

The analysis of the alterity construct and functioning of the issues plays a key role in reconstructing the coinage system. The importance of each coin type becomes evident only through the identification of its correct place in the system,\textsuperscript{104} and that is the primary goal of the research project B-4-2. Furthermore, for the adequate evaluation of the relevance of coin types. The comparison on a regional level is as crucial as the analysis of the place where the coins were minted. Hence it is important to point out that the coins of Pautalia, Serdica, Philippopolis and Traianopolis, all part of the Krepost Hoard, refer to a particular period of unrest in the mid-3rd century AD, which is also reflected in the Belintsi find.

---

\textsuperscript{100} Dzanev\textsuperscript{2011}.
\textsuperscript{101} Jurukova\textsuperscript{1976, 214}.
\textsuperscript{102} See above p. 6.
\textsuperscript{103} See above p. 6.
\textsuperscript{104} Thus it becomes possible to use averse and reverse designs together with the weight and diameter to characterize the nominal values.
have very similar *averses*, which supports the idea suggested by Konrad Kraft of a common supply area (Lieferbezirk) of these coin types.\(^{105}\)

To summarize, the coins are simultaneously a medium of knowledge and a final product based on the knowledge communicated between the representatives of the polis élites responsible for the issuing. The local civic identity (the collective identity) was articulated on the coins by representative elements; these could refer to religious myths, cultural heritage, geographical surroundings, historical events, linguistic aspects, etc.

5 Summary

If scholars of ancient studies wish to participate in and contribute to current research on analytical categories of knowledge, space and identity, they need to investigate what such concepts can offer with respect to improving our empirically based understanding of ancient societies; in the process, they may come up with some new ideas about how to develop those very concepts further. In our view, the use of a ‘trialectics’ as a *dialectique de triplicité* of knowledge, space and identity can potentially be successful in developing a conceptual framework suitable for varied sources, times and regions, and for a multiplicity of specialist questions. Focusing on processes rather than states enables researchers not only to investigate transformations and discontinuities, but also tendencies to stabilize and establish spaces, knowledges and identities – or to destabilize them. Moreover, the triialectic approach encourages researchers to reflect on their own research and how it is embedded in current social conditions. An important additional advantage of such research is a critique of ideologies of historical continuity that serve to underwrite present-day political claims. Studies of the past, in addition to what they produce in the way of material, images and texts, primarily provide us with an enormous knowledge of the temporal depth of interactions between knowledge, space and identities, all the while insisting on the historicization and contextualization of these concepts.

The Hittite ritual compositions testify to the intense process of ‘acculturation’ and cultural exchanges which took place in Anatolia (Turkey) during the period of the Hittite kingdom. It is possible to identify elements in these texts which belong to different ‘traditions’ of Hittite ritual knowledge – what has been defined as ‘cultural strata’ or *Kultschichten* in secondary literature. One of the most interesting aspects of these cultural strata is their ‘trialectic’ dimension. Not only is each ritual knowledge often characterized by spatial connotations in the texts, such as places, kingdoms or cities, but these two dimensions (the constructs of knowledge and space) combined together can be used to understand the third dimension, ‘identity’. This construct circumscribes the local scribal community where the ritual knowledge was produced. In this way it becomes possible to investigate the local ritual traditions and to understand their role in the formation of Hittite ritual knowledge.

In another historical case, ancient coins can construct spaces of identity that are to be understood as products of knowledge negotiated discursively between the members of polis élites responsible for the production of coin images. What is more, coin images provide insights into various transformation processes which lead to the formation of or change in identities. They demonstrate to what extent native, local or regional traditions, myths and roots were preserved or modified. Furthermore, they give evidence of the adaptation of external influences or the conscious dissociation from such influences.

\(^{105}\) Kraft [1972] defends the hypothesis of the existence of mobile coin workshops that possessed a fixed range of types. As a result, particular types – especially the conventional ones – were probably adopted and copied by the individual cities.
Ancient studies can contribute to a relativization of our current conceptions of knowledge, space and identities, especially of unspoken assumptions about their generalizability; our investigations have the potential to enrich these concepts with specific, ostensibly remote case studies when we take a consistent relational view of the interaction between knowledge, space and identity and their historical (re-)production.
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