become unsporting? Again, given that it was beyond the pale to be a logographer, why did the Athenians allow their clients to use a system which arguably institutionalized deceit? Nevertheless, if H. has left questions unanswered, it is a merit of this complex and subtle study that it leaves one wanting to continue the debate.

University of Leeds ROGER BROCK

THE DELPHIC AMPHICTIONY

P. SÁNCHEZ: *L'Amphictionie des Pyles et de Delphes. Recherches sur son rôle historique des origines au IIe siècle de notre ère.* (*Historia* Einzelschriften 148.) Pp. 574, maps. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2001. Cased, DM 196. ISBN: 3-515-07785-5.

The Delphic Amphictiony held a unique place in Greek history from earliest times right down to the Roman conquest. Its importance devolves primarily, but not exclusively, from the fact that it found itself in charge of the most famous oracular shrine in the ancient world. Its significance is reflected in the literature from all periods of Greek history, and its wealth guaranteed that it would leave to posterity an abundance of inscribed information. Until the appearance of Sánchez's remarkable book, we have not had a comprehensive and up-to-date study of the Amphictiony.

S.'s history pulls together all the major evidence, both literary and epigraphical, and surveys a full range of modern theories regarding the nature and functioning of the Amphictiony. The result is a critical study that lacks nothing in scope or depth of analysis, one that promises to be the standard reference work for years to come. This is especially true thanks to the book's meticulous organization and generous use of sub-headings.

Despite the abundance of surviving evidence, there is disagreement among scholars regarding some of the most fundamental things regarding the functioning of the Council. Inscriptions indicate that the *hieromnemones* voted at the meetings of the Amphictiony. *Hieromnemones* are rarely mentioned in the literature, however, which usually speaks of *pylagoroi* or *agoratroi* instead. There is little doubt that all of these officials represented the member states in some way. In two appendixes, S. attempts to explain the relationship between the Council of the Amphictiony and its members. In Appendix I (pp. 496–509), he concludes that *pylagoroi* and *agoratroi* are synonymous terms for elected delegates who went to the Council to argue cases before it, but did not vote except in the rarest of emergencies. In the second appendix (pp. 510–15), he addresses the relationship between member communities and the Council. Important matters would first be broached at the Council. After consultation at home, the *hieromnemones* would return to the Council and pass the appropriate motion. This act brought the question to an end; the member communities did not formally ratify the Council's decisions.

I have spoken of member states, but S. shows that that expression actually misrepresents the case of most of the members. He speaks of 'peuples membres' throughout the book. The reason is that the Amphictiony began as an organization of peoples who sent delegates from the cities within their territories on a rotating basis. Even Athens and Sparta claimed membership not in their own right as city-states but as members of the larger communities of Ionians and Dorians.

The history of the Amphictiony begins in the archaic period and fades after the

interventions of various Roman emperors, particularly Augustus, Nero, and Hadrian. It can be broken down into epochs: the early archaic period when the Council met at Anthela; the later archaic and classical, when (from about 581/0) the Amphictiony destroyed Crisa and consecrated its land to Apollo (thus giving Apollo's oracle access to the sea), and established Delphi as its regular place of meeting; the eventful fourth century, which began with a period of construction and the creation of the office of *naopoies*, was interrupted by the Phocian seizure of the shrine in 356 followed by Philip's intervention in 346, when he gained the two seats of the Phocians for himself (not the Macedonian people) and ushered in a period of Macedonian control; the period of Aetolian domination when, from the wars of Alexander's Successors into the Hellenistic age, the Aetolian League took advantage of the general confusion to gain extensive control of the region around Delphi and dominated the Council by absorbing a large number of the 'member peoples' and thus, presumably, securing their votes; a period (largely in the first century B.C.E.) in which the Delphians increasingly secured independence from the Aetolians by appealing for and winning the support of the Roman Senate; the imperial age, which began with Augustus' massive reorganization of the whole region under the dominance of Nicopolis, his new foundation after his victory at Actium, which continued with Nero's confiscation of the sacred lands to settle his veterans, and which concluded with Hadrian's attempts at restoring the traditional status quo as far as he could.

From period to period, representation on the Council changed, sometimes dramatically. I have noted the fluctuations in the levels of control experienced by the Aetolians and the sudden dominance of Nicopolis (ten out of twenty-four seats, reduced significantly under Nero), but the most persistent theme involves an apparent ongoing conflict between the Thessalians and Delphi. The change of location in archaic times for the meetings of the Council from Anthela in the north to Delphi much further south was perhaps a blessing for all members of the Amphictiony in that it secured the important and lucrative oracle of Apollo and the celebration of the Pythian games. But the move southward must surely have caused the Thessalians concern, for it placed them more on the geographical fringe than near the focus of the organization as at first. By contrast, from the first century B.C.E., when Delphi had the ear of the Roman Senate, until the reign of Hadrian, the importance of Greece shifted northward, in Roman eyes at least, and later emperors recognized this shift by favouring the Thessalian lobby without completely destroying the traditional prestige of Delphi.

From the time of the battle of the Crocus Field in 352 Philip had presented himself as the would-be deliverer and protector of Apollo's seat at Delphi. His appropriation of the two Phocian votes in 346 revolutionized the ground rules for membership in the Amphictiony, and his objectives are beyond doubt: he saw the Amphictiony as a moral high ground from which he could influence the minds of the Greeks while he sought to master their destinies. Philip's lesson was not lost on subsequent powers. The Aetolians saw the advantages of controlling the votes on the Council, while at the same time advertising the fact that they were not despoiling the treasures. The Romans especially, despite some drastic interference, understood instinctively that the Amphictiony was an ideal channel for messages of propaganda that they wished to send to the Greek world.

Perhaps the most enjoyable quality of S.'s historical style is his ability to proceed from epoch to epoch without losing sight of the *longue durée*—nearly a thousand years—of Amphictionic history. Through it all, the mission of the Council was limited to overseeing the approaches to the sacred places, and protecting the markets, the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.146 Published online by Cambridge University Press

visitors, especially musicians, and others with a special rôle to play at the games. S. uses his thorough knowledge of the ancient evidence to detect anachronisms in the remarks of Strabo and, particularly, the exaggerated claims made for the Council by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (pp. 37–57).

The book concludes with ten tables, five maps, a bibliography that does not include works fully cited in the footnotes, and three indexes (literary sources, epigraphical sources and proper names, and other matters).

No serious historian of antiquity can afford to ignore this book. Historians of Greece will need to own and use it at least as a reference work, but its quality repays careful reading.

University of Victoria GORDON SHRIMPTON

A FESTSCHRIFT FOR A. J. GRAHAM

V. B. GORMAN, E. W. ROBINSON (edd.): *Oikistes. Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World offered in Honor of A. J. Graham.* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 234.) Pp. xvii + 396, maps, ills. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2002. Cased, €89/US$104. ISBN: 90-04-12579-5.

A. J. Graham, after working with distinction as an undergraduate and a research student at King's College, Cambridge, and serving briefly at Bedford College, London, spent the first half of his career at the University of Manchester and the second half as a professor at the University of Pennsylvania. This volume in his honour contains an introduction by his erstwhile Pennsylvania colleague M. Ostwald and articles by eighteen of his pupils (one, G. Burton, from Manchester, the others from Pennsylvania). The articles reflect the range of Graham's academic interests: predominantly Greek, but extending both to Rome and to the near east; arranged in three thematic sections, on Law, History and Constitutions, on Colonization and Cult, and on Military Matters.

In the first section C. W. Hedrick asks what materials the classical Greek chronographers could have worked from, and focuses on monuments originally set up for purposes not of chronology but of commemoration. E. G. Millender sees in the descriptions of the Spartans' fearful obedience in the Persian War and the Peloponnesian War the Athenians' contrast between that and their own better-motivated discipline. E. W. Robinson suggests that the lead tablets found at Camarina served some civic purpose but not necessarily one connected with democratic procedures. On the Roman side, H. I. Flower sees in the *SC de Bacchanalibus* an attack on the intrusion of men into women's religious rôles and on the importing of public structures into private religious associations. G. Forsythe argues that Valerius Antias wrote between *c.* 70 and *c.* 40 B.C., not a generation earlier, and that he and Cn. Gellius wrote at far greater length than Livy on early Rome, with fictitious speeches and battle narratives. G. Burton adds the resolution of disputes between communities and the regulation of privileges for communities to the usual list of means by which the Romans maintained the stability of their empire.

In the section on Colonization and Cult G. Salapata studies the cult of Alexandra (Cassandra) at Amyclae and her increase in prominence over Agamemnon. L. Onyshkevych interprets the texts inscribed on a bone plaque from Berezan as a

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.146 Published online by Cambridge University Press