much to Eretrian precedents, perhaps observed by Cleisthenes himself, who may have been in exile at Eretria. The chronology is tight, since the Eretrian 'democracy' supposedly originated *c.* 509; it is unfortunate that W. could not use my 'Cleisthenes (of Athens) and Corinth', in P. Derow, R. Parker (edd.), *Herodotus and his World* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 219–34, on Corinthian possibilities. In his final substantial chapter, W. finds Herodotus guilty of 'deliberate falsification for his Athenian patrons' (p. 273): Eretria led the external contribution to the Ionian Revolt and won a 'great victory over the [Persian] fleet' in the Pamphylian sea (recorded by Plutarch, but not in Herodotus). Athenian 'desertion' of the Ionians was 'disgraceful', and was repeated when Athens and its *klerouchoi* 'abandoned Eretria without a fight in 490'.

W. follows a minority view of archaic chronology in general and that of the Corinthian tyranny in particular: the low chronology of Will, and more recently Parker. That creates difficulties in relating Eretria to a more general context; but, astoundingly, there remain in the text traces of what was presumably an earlier stage of composition at which he followed the standard high chronology: 'Under Periandros, Corinth founded Potidaea between 625–585' (p. 190; cf. p. 200).

University of Nottingham JOHN SALMON
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni311

MESSENIAN ETHNICITY

J. SIAPKAS: *Heterological Ethnicity. Conceptualizing Identities in Ancient Greece.* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis: Boreas: Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations 27.) Pp. x + 331, map. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2003. Paper. ISBN: 91-554-5823-8.

The book presents itself as an investigation of the effect of theoretical assumptions on conceptualizations of the past by modern scholars, focusing on the perception and investigation of ethnicity. In other words, this is a book on the history and—to a minor extent—the sociology of scholarship. As a test case, Siapkas has selected the Messenians, certainly a good choice if one intends to test scholarly assumptions on ethnic and cultural continuity. The investigation is allegedly conducted according to the heterological tradition, i.e. following M. de Certeau. In fact, apart from perhaps twenty pages at the beginning and at the end of the book, de Certeau's influence is not particularly obvious. Most of the time, the reader is treated to a cento of short appraisals of scholarly work.

After two introductory chapters, one setting the stage and the other introducing some of de Certeau's ideas on the practice of historiography, the book is divided in two main parts, devoted to primordialism and instrumentalism respectively. Each part is divided in three sections: first comes a discussion of selected scholars representing the one or the other school, then a somewhat longer review of primordialism and instrumentalism in Greek history and archaeology, and finally a more detailed presentation of research on Messenia and the Messenians. Sources are referred to almost only in the third section of the first part. In S.'s view, reading the sources seems to be characteristic of primordialist scholars, who follow what S. calls the culture historical method. It is not completely clear what this method is, except that critical reading of the sources seems to be one of its hallmarks (see e.g. p. 222: the culture

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

historical approach implies having opinions about specific details of the sources, such as whether or not there was a revolt in Messenia at the time of Marathon; cf. pp. 97 and 117).

The first part, on primordialism, is structurally a bit awkward. Although it is fair to say that scholars working in the historicist tradition of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were implicitly primordialists, in the sense that they took ethnicity as a given, explicit primordialist models have been developed only fairly recently, which means that the scholars discussed in the first section are in no sense the methodological counterpart of scholars who appear in the following two sections, on primordialism as applied to Greek history in general and to the Messenians in particular. Some consideration of nationalist and racist thought from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries would perhaps have been more helpful. The scrutiny of (mostly implicitly) primordialist scholarship on the Messenians is structured chronologically, and this makes it possible for S. to include here some references to ancient evidence.

The part on instrumentalism seems more successful to the present reviewer, especially as far as the general discussion of archaeological and anthropological research is concerned. Here S. has good observations, e.g. on the strengths and problems of different theories of ethnicity when applied to historical processes. When it comes to Messenia, S. uses the section to review scholarship on Spartan society, from Moses Finley to Stephen Hodkinson, most of which is actually rather primordialist in terms of its approach to ethnicity, as S. himself recognizes. Why the work of these scholars should be dealt with here is not clear.

The book deals essentially with the history of scholarship, and one wonders if S. is really equipped for such an enterprise. Piero Treves's article on the problem of Messenian history, which came out in 1944 (!), is commented upon (p. 129) without any reference to the fact that the author was an Italian Jew and a socialist, writing in exile in Britain. Ascriptions of scholars to schools are often odd. Anthony Smith would be quite surprised at being classed a primordialist—but then, what to say of Georges Dumézil and Werner Jaeger, who are called classical archaeologists (p. 51)? In general, beyond vague concepts such as the culture historical approach, S. does not seem to have a very clear sense of the development of theories and methods before the last quarter of the twentieth century.

The general quality of the book is very uneven. References to the sources are often confused (e.g. pp. 77–8) and sometimes downright wrong (pp. 79–80: *pace* S., IvO 252 does not commemorate a Spartan victory over the Messenians). Awkward statements such as Mount Ithome 'in the middle of the Pamisos Valley' or 'Messenia, like other Dorian states, used Heraklids as the eponymous heroes of their [*sic*] tribes' (p. 145) are not infrequent. S. seems to think that the Damonon inscription was found at Thuria (p. 62 n. 198). Inaccuracies can be found in the presentation of the views of other scholars, too, which somewhat curtails the value of an otherwise impressive bibliographic tour de force.

Finally, a word about language. Like the present reviewer, S. is not a native speaker of English. Considering how he masters scholarship in a number of different languages, it would be ungenerous to criticize his command of the English language. However, sentences like 'helots were involuntarily exploited' (p. 98) occur frequently and it is often frankly difficult to understand what S. is trying to say. Arranging for copy-editing by a native speaker would have enhanced the value of this book.

Harvard University NINO LURAGHI
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni312

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni312 Published online by Cambridge University Press