types), Mazarakis Ainian (the main town), and Gounaris (its urban form and city walls), the last two essentially forming a single report with one set of illustrations. Stos-Gale provides the counterpart to Gale's study of prehistoric metallurgy on Keos, while Themelis tracks the Hellenistic sculptor Damophon of Messene as far as the proud *polis* of Kythnos. Sheedy and Papageorgiadou survey the (until now) under-researched coinage of the island, while Brun picks out long-term continuity and change in the economy.

Despite the inevitable gaps in coverage, the scale and range of this volume are such that for many themes and periods it will be an indispensable reference point for anyone embarking on research in the Aegean.

University of Leicester GRAHAM SHIPLEY

ANCIENT PHOKIS

J. McInerney: *The Folds of Parnassos: Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis*. Pp. xvi + 391, maps, ills. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999. Paper, $24.95. ISBN: 0-292-75230-X.

Ancient Phokis extended further north-east and east, and less far west, than the modern *nomós* of Phokída. The Phokians are regarded as bit-part players in history, yet their strategic location embroiled them in great events. Like other regions, they illustrate the interplay between settlement, environment, and culture and the variety of Greek state forms.

This book, based on the author's 1992 doctoral thesis, aspires to identify different 'narratives' and establish the character of Phokis's ethnic identity. The main part (pp. 1–262) is structured by thematic issues in a broadly chronological sequence. After a brief introduction, Chapter 2 discusses the Phokians as an ethnic group, particularly with reference to the early Iron Age. Chapter 3 describes the landscapes of different sub-regions and Phokis' shifting boundaries. Chapter 4 moves on to settlement numbers and diachronic changes, explaining the absence of a dominant *polis* by the rise of Delphi (though earlier it was explained by the landscape). Fortified sites are interpreted as refuges rather than towns, and the settlement pattern is categorized as non-nucleated because of the likely predominance of pastoralism, invoked to explain the dearth of datable pottery. Chapter 5 examines local myths and identifies a tendency for Phokian communities to trace their ancestry from almost anywhere but Phokis; being Phokian, it is claimed, involved asserting local difference within an overarching ethnic unity.

In Chapter 6 the alleged Phokian connection with Ionian Phokaia is found plausible, and the origins of the Delphic Amphiktyony are traced. Though unconvinced by modern reconstructions of the first sacred war (600–590), M. prefers not to dismiss it as fiction and sees it as a local affair in which Delphi's wealth provoked its neighbours into an attempt to take it over. Thessalian aggression in the sixth century provoked more formal unity, the common threat bringing the Phokians together to earn two famous victories, in the 'battle of chalk' and the 'battle of the amphoras' (Hdt. 3.27–8). The introduction of a common coinage in the late sixth century reflected a further move towards statehood. Chapter 7 examines the political history of the fifth and early fourth centuries, when Phokis was at the mercy of Athens, Sparta, and Thebes. By the mid-fourth century, we can see a Phokian élite set apart by education and property. The absence of 'synoicism' (M.'s spelling), and the late date at

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.134 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which complex civic and federal institutions developed, are explained by the absence of 'big man' culture and the strength of local families. The third sacred war (356–346) revealed the inability of such a loose federal state to mobilize its military potential. Chapter 8 argues that the crippling indemnity imposed upon the Phokians after 346 was a spur to stronger federal structures, reinforced by the need to band together with the southern Greeks in 338 (or did increased unity strengthen the capacity for resistance?). The increased formalization of federal and *polis* institutions in the third century may reflect a continuing sense of vulnerability. The Phokians fended off the Successors and helped repulse the Gauls, but suffered Aitolian rule in the mid-third century, freeing themselves only to suffer domination by Macedonia and Rome. Second-century changes in the federal structure reflect the revival of a narrow élite and the weakening of central authority.

Appendix 1 (pp. 263–332) is a useful gazetteer of the thirty-odd named ancient settlements, with brief discussions of their identifications, archaeology, and historical significance. Appendix 2 discusses routes into central Greece. Appendix 3 demonstrates that Phokian fortified sites formed a system linked by sight-lines, and argues that most were built during the third sacred war. The bibliography is full, though there are surprising gaps and some typographic wrinkles. The index suffers from the usual fault of inconveniently long sequences of page numbers in some entries. The maps are poor: there are no scales, legends are sometimes damaged, and there is no indication of Phokis in relation to surrounding regions.

M. has made a worthy attempt to formulate and tackle major issues in Phokian history, but his discussions could be sharper. Some of the methodological digressions (e.g. on nineteenth-century theories of Greek tribes, or on Greek pastoralism) are too general to sustain the interpretations of Phokis put forward in their wake. Elsewhere he quotes still-active scholars for their views of twenty years ago, and attacks athenocentric scholarship, the positivistic treatment of ancient ethnic groups, and the neglect of the period after Chaironeia—all unsustainable charges, given the last two decades of scholarship. Despite his modishness, old-fashioned views surface, such as that Mycenaean society was disrupted by incomers from the north (p. 127) and that pottery styles indicate particular social groups (pp. 160–1). Do Thessalian names in Phokian myths show that some Phokians came from there (p. 147)? The treatment of the *ethnos* is tangled: *ethnos* and *genos* are used interchangeably, and each is translated 'tribe', as is *phylê*, though the reader is kept in the dark about it. M. is aware of the problems of 'tribe', but does not follow through. Given that ethnic identity is contested and fluid, what are we to make of statements like 'Phokis [was not] occupied by a single ethnic group' (p. 180)?

Seemingly unaware of important recent work on the *polis*, M. understates the importance of the *polis* in pre-fourth-century Greece. To be sure, late archaic Greece was hardly a land of 'cities' in a modern geographer's sense, but the correct response is to change one's definition of *polis*, not to claim that the Greeks did not live in *poleis*. The term 'synoicism' is used loosely: does it mean the development of nucleated centres or the fusion of existing centres, with or without physical relocation? Such points might be clearer if the site catalogue gave more indication of the extent of surviving remains, or if M. considered more fully whether site numbers bear any relation to population numbers. His account of landscapes, though sensitive and detailed, does not adequately explain how sub-regions relate to one another and to neighbouring regions, and underplays the unifying effect of the Kephisos valley.

All too often ones wishes for more precise formulations. To speak of '[t]he persistent hostility of the Greeks towards pastoralism' (p. 115) is to go beyond the evidence M.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.134 Published online by Cambridge University Press

has just cited. What, precisely, does it mean to say that 'Kleisthenes understood ethnicity as a matter of identification' (p. 31), that 'Thessaly embarked on a campaign of territorial expansion designed to extend hegemony to the borders of Boiotia' (p. 174), or that Delphi was 'under Spartan influence' (p. 193)? The treatment of élites is vague and appears contradictory. The existence of an archaic élite, which M. sometimes seems to doubt, can surely be inferred from the prominence of Phokian cavalry. M. thinks the narrowness of the Phokian élite in the Hellenistic age remarkable; but narrow élites are typical of that period. He underestimates the force of second-century federalism (e.g. p. 199), regarding it as by now anachronistic (p. 255)—even though the Phokians invested in a new federal monument.

I am sympathetic to many of the questions M. sets out to answer, and admire his wide-ranging discussion and his deep understanding of Phokis as a region. Important questions, however, remain open to debate.

University of Leicester GRAHAM SHIPLEY

PELOPONNESIAN PLACE-NAMES

G. A. Pikoulas: *Λεξικὸ τῶν οἰκισμῶν τῆς Πελοποννήσου· παλαιὰ καὶ νέα τοπωνύμια* (*Ἡ μεγάλη βιβλιοθήκη*). Pp. 627. Athens: Horos, 2001. Cased, €50. ISBN: 960-85691-2-5.

All too often, when trying to pin down archaeological findspots in the Greek landscape, one is thrown off track by the mutability of place-names. The student consulting older reports of excavations on Samos quickly discovers that the ancient remains once located at Tigáni (Frying-pan Harbour) have mysteriously migrated to Pythagóreio (Pythagorasville), a place unknown to earlier visitors but known to the ancients as Samos. The last name, in turn, is now that of the modern capital on the north coast, commonly known by its earlier name of Vathý, though the latter is officially only the name of the upper town, formerly Áno Vathý . . .

The roots of this confusion lie in the turbulent history and contested cultural heritage of the modern Greek state. Since the nineteenth century, there have been moves to classicize place-names, to invent new Greek names for places with Turkish or Albanian names, or to adopt ancient names (which often, in fact, refer to an archaeological site several miles away). One aim has been to purify the landscape of traces of earlier invaders and occupiers. More controversially (as shown by the well-chosen epigraphs in this book, taken from both sides of the debate), the aim may be to recall selectively an imagined past. Invented names, however, tend to be bland and repetitious, while assignments of ancient names to particular localities are apt to be falsified by later research. More regrettably, the alteration of place-names obliterates the lived experience and memory of the present-day landscape—or would do so, if the popular names did not remain current in speech as often as they do. Lakonians still habitually refer to Kalloní as Pérpeni; while Aphysoú, a name of uncertain etymology and variable spelling, has happily not been replaced by any modern coinage or classical name (though there are all too tempting candidates in the vicinity of Sparta), let alone supplanted by the chilly official form Aphísion.

Pikoulas and his collaborators have collated records of all known settlements (around 4,500) from the seventeenth century onwards, in order to assist researchers in identifying settlements that have been renamed or abandoned. A typical entry includes the current name (sometimes with a colloquial form), previous name (there are 818

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.134 Published online by Cambridge University Press