in colour (presumably yellow?). This denotes a lack of post-draft control by the author, but most culpably by the editors who did not go through the text before sending it to the printing machines. Many typos (double spaces, capital letters missing, etc.) are also observable throughout the volume. The bibliography looks pretty unusual as well. It looks like a mix of different citation styles, with consistency issues. With these types of ready-to-go publications, there are more pitfalls than advantages to the author, especially a young scholar. A more accurate control would have allowed to author to produce a better book.

Rocco Palermo
University of Groningen
r.palermo@rug.nl

Jim, S.F. 2014. *Sharing with the Gods. Aparchai and Dekatai in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Korres, M. 1988. 'Athènes', in G.Touchais (ed.), *Chroniques des fouilles et dècouvertes archéologiques en Grèce en 1987* (Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique). Paris : De Boccard.

Lazzarini, M.L. 1976. *Le Forme delle Dediche Votive nella Grecia Arcaica*. Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei.

Lohr, C. 2000. *Griechische Familien-weihungen: Untersuchungen einer Reprasentationsform von ihren Anfangen bis zum Ende des 4.Jhs. v. Chr.* (Internationale Archaologie 54). Rahden: Lolling.

Aneta Petrova. *Funerary Reliefs from the West Pontic Area (6th-1st Centuries BC)* (Colloquia Antiqua 14). pp. XXII+312, 27 b/w plates. 2015. Leuven–Paris–Bristol, CT: Peeters. ISBN 978-90-429-3088-9. €95.

Aneta Petrova's book is a most welcome contribution to research on the Greek colonies on the West Pontic coast. Based on her doctoral dissertation defended in 2005, it brings together all known funerary monuments with figured relief decoration from the region. To my knowledge, the archaeological investigations in the last decade or so have not added new specimens – at least not from present-day Bulgaria, where large-scale excavations have been conducted in the necropoleis of Apollonia and Mesambria.

Due to the limited expertise of the reviewer in the field of ancient sculpture, the present text aims to provide a general overview of the book, with some comments that will put the study of the funerary reliefs in the broader context of the history and archaeology of the West Pontic region, with an accent on burial customs. For a complementary discussion, the reader can consult the review by R. Posamentir.[1]

One major merit of Petrova's book should be emphasized – while there have been studies on the West Pontic colonies that treat both Romanian and Bulgarian coast,[2] this is the first specialized monograph on a specific type of archaeological material that overcomes the inherent regionalism of the western littoral of the Black Sea. In this respect, it is regretful that the author chose not to compare the West Pontic with the North Pontic region and trace parallels or differences. This was apparently due to the lack of published corpora about the latter by the time Petrova was working on her doctoral thesis. The editor's introduction lists several such titles, published between 2006 and 2012 (p. XI).

The book is also a valuable addition to the study of the burial customs of the Greek colonies on the West Pontic coast. Almost all necropoleis in the region have been excavated to some extent and there are summarizing publications that offer useful overviews.[3] However, the archaeologists that excavate and study them are interested more in the burial structures, grave inventories, etc. Usually, they are less knowledgeable in the specific field of ancient sculpture, more related to art history, and grave markers are often given only a cursory treatment. In addition, as a rule, the funerary reliefs from the region have not been discovered in their ancient context. Thus, Petrova's book elucidates a frequently overlooked aspect of the Greek funerary space in the region.

In this line of thought, the reader would have profited from a presentation, if only a short one with a few references, of the respective necropoleis. It is certainly beyond the intended scope of the book and not including it was the choice of the author, but it would have provided some context and shed more light on the state of research. The burial customs in the region are rather diverse and illustrate different attitudes and approaches to the funerary sphere – for example the clear separation of a North Dobrudzhan group of Histria and Orgame with cremation as the preferred rite. These two are also the only cities with excavated Archaic

[1] Posamentir 2016.
[2] E.g. Oppermann 2004.
[3] See for example Panayotova 2007 for the Bulgarian part of the West Pontic coast and Lungu 2007 for the Romanian.

graves, some of them quite 'exotic'. In Chapter 6, Petrova addresses briefly the debate 'Greek vs. Thracian' regarding the attribution of Histrian tumuli,[4] although her argument in favour of the Greek interpretation – the use of funerary stelae with Greek names – cannot really apply to the most controversial Archaic ones (with presumed human sacrifices). There are also Ionian and Dorian cities, and Mesambria and Callatis (the two Dorian poleis) do reveal similar burial practices in the Hellenistic Period.

The book consists of an introduction, six chapters, a conclusion, and a catalogue. The latter lists 96 monuments and takes up almost half the volume. Actually, these are less than a third (more like a quarter) of all known tombstones from the region, where the majority of the markers are plain slabs or pillars or pediment stelae, only with the inscribed name of the deceased.

The state of research, addressed in the Introduction, is important. The short overview reveals the great inequality in the numbers of known gravestones from the different Greek poleis – from 120 from Apollonia to only two from Dionysopolis and two from Orgame, leaving aside sites of less clear character, such as Akhtopol (1), Kiten (1), and Naulochos (1). Tomis is overlooked in the list here, but appears with one gravestone at the beginning of Chapter 2. Recent investigations in the necropolis of Apollonia have increased dramatically the total number of gravestones. With some new titles to add to Petrova's bibliography,[5] the published stones are already about 180, and they should easily exceed 200 with the unpublished ones. Nonetheless, these new finds have not modified essentially the existing picture.

The chronological distribution within the discussed period is also quite uneven, with five (or four?) Archaic gravestones against 141 Classical and 160 Hellenistic (not taking into account the new finds from Apollonia). Therefore, I cannot completely concur with the expressed opinion that 'the existing data are largely representative' (p. 4), at least concerning the Archaic (and earlier Classical) times, for which the picture is definitely fragmentary. Here is an example of the things that may have existed or are not yet discovered: a few years ago, an unusual marble monument was brought to the museum in present-day Sozopol (ancient Apollonia), where it is currently displayed. It is a short pillar with a separately made egg mounted on top of it, resembling a 'phalloid' gravestone known from Thera;[6] there are traces of an erased inscription on the pillar. Reportedly, it has been discovered in unknown circumstances in the territory of the Late Archaic or Early Classical necropolis. Such a rare type of monument could serve to illustrate the incompleteness of our knowledge.

Then comes the ratio of the undecorated to relief monuments from different cities (and different periods). In the case of Apollonia, the latter are only eight for the entire period under consideration (two Archaic and six Hellenistic). Petrova has counted 94 gravestones from the 5th–4th centuries BC, among them only one decorated with simple circular rosettes. All new finds are from the same period, but the number of the relief specimens has not changed. On the other hand, half of all known gravestones from Mesambria have relief decoration, and for the Classical Period there are four out of twelve with figured scenes (the only Classical reliefs from the entire region). Comparing the two neighbouring cities, less than 30km away across the Bay of Burgas, one would agree with Petrova's suggestion that 'different social practices in the sphere of funerary display' were at play in the two cities (see below).

The first three chapters, entitled 'Typology and Characteristics of...', are dedicated respectively to the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic gravestones from the region. Chapter 1 is very short, as it has to deal with only five monuments – one plain stele from Apollonia, dated to the 6th century BC based on the *boustrophedon* inscription, and four anthemion stelae, two from Apollonia and two from Histria. Of the latter, all but one are fragmentary, and the last one – the famous stele of Deines from Apollonia (A-2 in the catalogue), the only one with figured decoration, lacks the separately made anthemion. The fragments from Histria illustrate unusual variants and are compared to monuments from Perinthos, Daskyleion, and other sites. R. Posamentir has challenged the proposed Archaic date (c. 530 BC) of the other Apollonian monument (A-1), comparing it to gravestones from the later 5th century BC (and reducing the number of Archaic monuments to only four). This could have further implications, as it is also the only one made of local limestone and not of imported marble; redating it to the Classical Period would remove the only solid evidence about a local workshop producing decorated gravestones in the Archaic Period. The entire iconographic part of the chapter discusses the stele of Deines, dated to the early 5th century BC – a tall amphiglyph with one of the images effaced.

[4] For a synopsis of the opinions, see Damyanov 2012: 41–43.
[5] Gyuzelev 2013 and 2017.
[6] Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 242–244, Fig. 51c.

The preserved figure of an elder man, playing with a dog, is thought to denote the aristocratic status of the deceased. Petrova does not offer an opinion on the proposed interpretations of the two sides – different persons or one person in different roles, but tends to allow for a small chronological difference between them.

Chapter 2 is slightly longer, as the material is much more copious, with monuments from almost all sites. Several types are distinguished: plain stelae, pediment stelae, cornice stelae, anthemion stelae, and *naiskos* stelae. Limestone was preferred for the plain and cornice stelae, and imported marble was the material of choice for the others. After the plain gravestones, pediment stelae are most numerous and Petrova tends to date their introduction in the region to the 4th century BC. Except for two examples with rosettes, one from Apollonia and one from Mesambria, they lack relief decoration, but are decorated with painted motifs. For some reasons, probably the best known such monument – a large stele (1.72m high) from Apollonia[7] – is not mentioned here. The published reconstructions of the decoration feature two peculiar scenes – a bird and a dolphin (?) on the pediment and lion attacking a stag on the shaft,[8] and an up-do-date comment would have been welcome. Of all West Pontic poleis, only Mesambria has yielded four stelae with figured relief decoration – two with seated women, one with *Dexiosis,* and one with a standing woman, all of them with good parallels in the Attic funerary relief.

Chapter 3 treats the bulk of the finds from the region. The period marks a pronounced change in the geographic distribution of the material – Mesambria comes first with 52 gravestones, followed by Histria (35), Odessos (25), and Callatis (25 with the one from Vama Veche in the territory of the polis), while Apollonia is represented with only 16. The author does not explain this sudden drop, but it has to do with the development of Apollonia in the Hellenistic Period; an abrupt shrinking of the necropolis is observed in the middle of the 3rd century BC,[9] indicating a profound crisis (and excavations have been conducted mainly in the necropolis from mid-5th to the mid-3rd century BC). Nonetheless, in the early 2nd century BC funerary reliefs appear in Apollonia for the first time after a hiatus of three centuries.

Another significant change from the previous period is that most gravestones are made of marble, even the plain stelae that are second in number after the pediment stelae. Of the latter, two types are distinguished – with a moulding or with an obliquity at the base of the pediment. There are also cornice stelae, *naiskos* stelae (different from and smaller than the Classical ones), and wide slabs – another new type from the later Hellenistic Period, decorated only with funerary banquet scenes.

The larger part of Chapter 3 is dedicated to the iconography of the funerary relief and lists 13 different compositions (seated woman, seated man, alone or with other figures, funerary banquet, etc.) with comments and parallels for each one of them. The reader cannot but notice the frequent parallels drawn with Byzantium, the Propontis (Cyzicus), and north-western Asia Minor, and less often with other centres in East Greece. There are also regional or even local specifics – scenes that do not exist or occur rarely outside the study area, e.g. the compositions with a seated man, alone or with a small figure, with either the man or the servant holding a scroll (from Mesambria, Callatis, and Odessos), or with the seated figure holding a *kantharos* (from Callatis and Mesambria). Some monuments are outright unique – a relief of 'three seated and one standing figures shaking hands' (M-18), or another with a standing maiden with castanets (M-19). Common compositions have been noted for the Dorian poleis, but also regional differences within the study area. For example, the 'funerary banquet' is attested earlier (in the 2nd century BC) to the south of the Balkan Range, mainly in Mesambria, and later (in the 1st century BC) to the north, in Odessos, where the composition generally includes a female figure, absent to the south. Several monuments from the entire region depict horsemen in various schemes. The latest, one from Odessos (O-22) and one from Mesambria (M-28) display similarities with votive reliefs of local heroes from Odessos and its vicinity. Petrova is reluctant to accept M. Oppermann's opinion that monuments with horsemen could have been used by Hellenized Thracians in the Greek cities. In fact, not even one of the gravestones discussed in the book suggests a 'Thracian connection'.

Chapter 4 continues with the iconographic analysis, focusing on various elements of the composition – male and female figures, and attributes and furniture. Petrova discusses the connotations of the various attributes on tombstones – boxes and mirrors as typical female attributes indicating luxurious life and beauty, scrolls and writing implements as symbols of education, herms and

[7] Venedikov 1963: No. 1161, Pl. 179; Kurtz and Boardman 1971: Fig. 86.
[8] Venedikov and Gerasimov 1973: 365, Figs 90–91.
[9] Hermary et al. 2010: 81; Baralis et al. 2016: 164, 174–177; Damyanov forthcoming.

sundials related to the gymnasium or the palaestra, etc. Wreaths denote prominent citizens on Late Hellenistic monuments from Apollonia and Histria. G. Mihailov has listed the two from Apollonia as *tituli honorarii*,[10] but they are apparently gravestones. More intriguing is the combination of a wreath in the middle of a round altar, present on six 2nd c. BC monuments from Apollonia and Mesambria, four of them accompanied with the inscription *ho demos*. Petrova comments that such a combination never appears on gravestones outside of the study area. In one case (A-6), it is clear from the inscription that the deceased fell in battle, thus he was probably honoured by the city. The round altar has heroic connotations, and there are other heroic attributes on Hellenistic monuments. *Kantharoi* that appear as the only decoration on three gravestones from Mesambria and Dionysopolis could be such attributes, but also may betray membership of Dionysiac societies. Only the two Dorian cities have yielded four gravestones with men seated on thrones with lion's legs, symbolizing high public status. The text offers a wealth of detail, inevitably repeating some points already made in the previous chapters.

Chapter 5 discusses the production of gravestones and offers valuable observations. Limestone markers, rarely decorated (only one from Callatis has a figured relief scene) are regarded as locally made. On the other hand, the West Pontic cities did not possess marble quarries and the closest deposits are actually quite distant. Therefore, Petrova tends to consider all marble imported, while the lack of analyses impedes tracing its origin in most cases; she refers to published results from Histria, revealing imports from Ionia, Paros, and Attica in Archaic and Classical times, the latter two continuing into the Hellenistic Period, when also Proconessian marble appeared. Proceeding to actual production, the author regards only a handful of finished monuments as actually imported (A-2, M-5 and one of unknown provenance). Then, she emphasizes the distinction between the two separate stages of producing the stele and carving the relief. This is illustrated by the contradiction between the standard shapes and dimensions of the stelae from various cities and the differences in the reliefs, which indicates that semi-finished stelae were imported and the decoration was added locally. Regarding actual workshops, most probably every city had at least one that produced limestone (and marble) gravestones. There is more evidence from the Hellenistic Period. For example, a Mesambrian workshop in the second half of the 3rd – early 2nd centuries BC produced pediment stelae with obliquity at the base of the pediment, a workshop in Odessos produced *naiskos* stelae and other monuments at the very end of the Hellenistic Period, and a Histrian workshop produced high limestone bases with relief phialae.

The last Chapter 6 summarizes all her observations on the general trends and the local specifics in the development of the funerary relief in the West Pontic region. The evidence is presented separately for each city, arranged geographically from south to north – from Apollonia to Histria and Orgame (the latter is treated as part of the Histrian *chora*). Apollonia is a very peculiar case – with the largest number of gravestones and with no relief monuments from the period between the early 5th and the end of the 3rd century BC. Petrova suggests a prohibition on the use of funerary reliefs, related to the change from oligarchy to democracy, mentioned by Aristotle.[11] The monument of Deines, 'the noblest of the citizens', could serve as a good illustration of the old regime. Therefore, the study of funerary reliefs could shed light on the chronology of a very important episode in the city's history. It is worth adding that a presumed prohibition in the first half or the middle of the 5th century BC coincides with a sudden expansion of the Apollonian necropolis that more than doubled its area within the third quarter of the century,[12] again implying the involvement of the polis as a community. The reintroduction of the funerary reliefs around 200 BC was related to honouring citizens that probably died for the city in a period of crisis; the practice appears to have been short-lived. The evidence from Mesambria, especially the Classical reliefs, is also very important, as until recently the necropolis from this period was virtually unknown.[13] The presence of luxurious monuments, at least some of them imported, indicates a certain level of prosperity, and the strong Attic influence could be instructive about international relations (at the same time, while the name of neighbouring Apollonia is convincingly reconstructed in the Athenian Tribute Lists for 425/4 BC, the situation there is very different). There is nothing surprising in the wealth of Hellenistic monuments from Mesambria, which corresponds to other signs of a heyday in the 3rd–2nd centuries BC, for example the presence of gold jewellery in the graves.[14] Again, the specific and original iconographic schemes are mentioned for each city. In the section on Callatis,

[10] IGBulg. I^2, 395 and 395 quater, the latter erroneously referred to as 395 quinquies.

[11] Polit. 5, 6, 1305b.

[12] Hermary et al. 2010: 15, 77; Damyanov forthcoming.

[13] See Kiyashkina and Bozkova 2017: 8.

[14] Kiyashkina et al. 2012: Nos. 63–73; Tonkova 2007: 284–289.

Petrova notes the similarities with compositions from Mesambria, the two being Dorian colonies. More similarities could be adduced in the funerary sphere – e.g. the use of a specific type of bronze hydriae as cinerary urns in the later 4th century BC, or the construction of double cist graves in the Hellenistic Period.[15] As in Apollonia, the presence of high quality Archaic reliefs in Histria corresponds well with an aristocratic/oligarchic regime, again mentioned by Aristotle.

The Conclusion abandons this local approach and offers a broader overview of the entire region. Once again, one has to remember that the evidence from the Archaic Period is very meagre and it is difficult to gain a comprehensive vision. More observations are offered about the Classical Period: the introduction of the pediment and cornice stelae in the 4th century BC and the diversity and relatively wide distribution of the anthemion stelae that suggest they were better represented than the four known examples. In the Hellenistic Period, when pediment stelae were most numerous, those with a moulding at the base of the pediment continued from the previous period and were rarely decorated with relief representations. On the other hand, the stelae with obliquity at the base of the pediment were most popular in the second half of the 3rd and the first half of the 2nd centuries and usually had relief scenes. There are also some general observations regarding the iconography, for example that seated men were typical of the Dorian cities in the 3rd–2nd centuries BC, while standing men were depicted mainly in the Ionian colonies from the 2nd century BC onwards. Again, influences from Byzantium and Cyzicus have received special mention. There is sufficient epigraphic evidence to illustrate the contacts between the West Pontic region and the Propontis,[16] already from the Classical Period,[17] but one is tempted to wonder whether these influences could be also related to the Propontis as a possible source of marble.

The Catalogue is organised geographically, from south to north (from Apollonia to Orgame, with one monument of unknown provenance). There is a certain chronological order – first Archaic, then Classical, and Hellenistic, but it is not followed within these periods, where the gravestones are arranged in accordance with the iconographic schemes, and the ones without figured compositions are placed at the end. The result could be slightly confusing. The separate entries in the catalogue contain general information (origin, location, dimensions, etc.), detailed description, comments on the workmanship, short discussion on parallels and dating, and references. Bibliography, indices, and 27 plates follow the catalogue.

To conclude, Aneta Petrova's book is very useful and fills an enormous gap in the scholarship of the West Pontic Greek colonies. It brings together the monuments from the entire region and puts them into the context of the funerary relief in the ancient Greek world. By tracing parallels from far and wide, the author was able to detect influences, but also to reveal unique local developments. The timely publication with a reputed publisher should contribute to further advancements in the field.

Margarit Damyanov
National Archaeological Institute with Museum
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
2 Saborna Str., 1000 Sofia, Bulgaria
mmdamyanov@gmail.com

Baralis, A., K. Panayotova, T. Bogdanova, M. Gyuzelev, D. Nedev and K. Gospodinov 2016. Apollonia Pontica (Sozopol, Bulgaria): The results of the Franco-Bulgarian archaeological mission, in M. Manoledakis (ed.) *The Black Sea in the Light of New Archaeological Data and Theoretical Approaches. Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on the Black Sea in Antiquity held in Thessaloniki, 18–20 September 2015*: 153–179. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Damyanov, M. 2012. Normative and non-normative burial practices in the necropoleis of the Greek colonies in the western Black Sea area. *Ancient West and East* 11: 35–68.

Damyanov, M. forthcoming. Spatial developments in the necropolis of Apollonia Pontica, 5th to 3rd centuries BC, in O. Cordovana, C. Manetta and V. Stolba (eds) *Bifocal Perspectives on the Black Sea: Macro- and Microcosms*. Proceedings of the International Conference in AIAS, Aarhus, April 6–8, 2016.

Gyuzelev, M. 2013. Tituli sepulcrales in necropoli antiqua locis dictis *Kalfata* et *Budžaka* prope urbem Sozopolim reperti in effossionibus annorum MMIV at MMV. *Il Mar Nero* VII, (2007/2009): 115–148.

Gyuzelev, M. 2017. Foreigners in Apollonia (Sozopol, Bulgaria) according to inscribed funerary stones from the 5th and the 4th c. BC, in P. Kiyashkina, M. Damyanov, A. Bozkova and P. Delev (eds), *Nessebar, Volume Four. Proceedings of the International Conference 'Ancient Greek Necropoleis along the Black Sea Coast', Nessebar, October 4–7, 2012*: 109–115. Veliko Tarnovo: Faber.

[15] Damyanov 2012: 56–58.
[16] See e.g. Sayar 2016.
[17] Gyuzelev 2017: 109.

Hermary, A., K. Panayotova, A. Baralis, M. Damyanov and A. Riapov 2010. *Apollonia du Pont (Sozopol). La nécropole de Kalfata (Ve–IIIe s. av. J.-C.)*. Paris: Errance.

IGBulg. I2 = Mihailov, G. 1970. *Inscriptiones graecae in Bulgaria Repertae, Vol. I². Inscriptiones orae Ponti Euxini*. Sofia: Academia Litterarum Bulgarica.

Kiyashkina, P. and A. Bozkova 2017. A century of studies in the necropolis of Mesambria Pontica, in P. Kiyashkina, M. Damyanov, A. Bozkova and P. Delev (eds), *Nessebar, Volume Four. Proceedings of the International Conference 'Ancient Greek Necropoleis along the Black Sea Coast', Nessebar, October 4–7, 2012*: 7–22. Veliko Tarnovo: Faber.

Kiyashkina, P., A. Bozkova and T. Marvakov 2012. *A Guide to the Collections of the Archaeological Museum of Nessebar*. Nessebar: Archaeological Museum of Nessebar.

Kurtz, D. and J. Boardman 1971. *Greek Burial Customs*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Lungu, V. 2007. Necropoles grecques du Pont Gauche: Istros, Orgamé, Tomis, Callatis, in D. Grammenos and E. Petropulos (eds) *Ancient Greek Colonies in the Black Sea 2* (British Archaeological Reports, International Series 1675 Vol. 1): 337–382. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Oppermann, M. 2004. *Die westpontischen Poleis*. Langenweißbach: Beier & Beran.

Panayotova, K. 2007. Burial and post-burial rites in the necropoleis of the Greek colonies on the Bulgarian Black Sea littoral, in D. Grammenos and E. Petropulos (eds) *Ancient Greek Colonies in the Black Sea 2* (British Archaeological Reports, International Series 1675), Vol. 1: 85–126. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Posamentir, R. 2016. Aneta Petrova, Funerary Reliefs from the West Pontic Area (6th-1st Centuries BC). Colloquia Antiqua 14. Leuven; Paris; Bristol, CT: Peeters, 2015. Pp. xxi, 312 pages; 27 p. of plates. ISBN 9789042930889. €95.00. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2016.03.26.

Sayar, M. 2016. Die Beziehungen der Bevölkerung der griechischen Poleis des Propontis-Gebiets und der westpontischen Küste von der hellenistishen Zeit bis zum Ende der römischen Kaiserzeit, in V. Cojocaru and A. Rubel (eds) *Mobility in Research on the Black Sea Region*: 289–300. Cluj-Napoca: Mega Publishing House.

Tonkova, M. 2007. Jewellery fashion of the western Pontic colonies in the Hellenistic times (from the territory of Bulgaria), in M. Stefanovich and Ch. Angelova (eds) *PRAE: In honorem Henrieta Todorova:* 279–294, Sofia: National Archaeological Institute with Museum.

Venedikov, I. (ed.) 1963. *Apoloniya. Razkopkite v nekropola na Apoloniya prez 1947–1949 g*. Sofia: Balgarska akademiya na naukite.

Venedikov, I. and T. Gerasimov 1973. *Trakiiskoto izkustvo*. Sofia: Balgarski hudozhnik.

Maeve McHugh. *The Ancient Greek Farmstead*. viii+198, 58 b/w illustrations. 2017. Oxford/Philadelphia: Oxbow Books. ISBN 978-1-78570-640-0 paperback £36; e-publication £18.

While Greek farming has received plenty of scholarly attention, this is the first book-length study devoted to ancient Greek *farmsteads*. Given the amount of discussion about farmsteads – ranging from debating their archaeological signature to even questioning their very existence in the Greek world – it is remarkable that such a book was not written sooner. The contribution by Maeve McHugh, therefore, is very welcome because it is the first time that the ancient Greek farmstead is treated integrally, thereby tying together a very fragmented scholarly discourse.

Yet, McHugh's ambition goes further than summarizing the current debates surrounding the ancient Greek farm: she wants to place the archaeological farmstead in its socio-economic context, highlighting the realities for Greek farmers living in the countryside. Her approach is twofold: focusing on the variety of farmstead types, but also placing the farmsteads in agricultural networks using a GIS-based approach.

The first introductory chapter traces the history of the Greek farmstead in modern scholarship: from the discovery of the first houses in the countryside and the realization that they were farms, to the introduction of archaeological surface survey, leading to an 'explosion' of farms throughout many different countrysides. Though this introduction is concise, it takes the reader through the past 70 years or so of scholarship, going over the major advances and discussions in the field, while referring to a multitude of relevant literature. Regrettably, what is missing in this chapter is a placement of the Greek farmstead in space and time. Why, for example, is the colonial Greek landscape in Italy barely discussed, when many farmsteads have been surveyed and excavated there? Generally, the book is based heavily on evidence from modern day Greece, whereas the distribution of Greek farmsteads is much wider, and the introduction might have been the right place to explain why this is so.

With regard to chronology, the Greek farmstead is placed in the mid-Classical to the early-Hellenistic