developments and colonization. The significance of these changes at home and abroad is taken into account together with the outcome of contacts between Greeks and 'Others'. Finally, Ascra is regarded as a community 'midway between the simplicity of a Dark Age settlement and the complexity of the Archaic polis' (p. 148). It also provides the opportunity to include Hesiod in the discussion.

This book is clearly written by historians and not by archaeologists. Perhaps for this reason I feel that there are some misunderstandings in the way the archaeology of the period is treated. For example, it is not clear what the evidence suggesting Athens was in control of the whole of Attica might be or how we explain changes in burial customs at the beginning of the Sub-Mycenaean period, when, according to tradition, refugees arrived. The tradition of the Ionian migration is also taken as fitting the archaeological evidence but with new discoveries on the west coast of Asia Minor the whole issue has become more complex. But even if the tradition is right about the arrival of refugees, why did they not explore the rest of Attica rather than endanger themselves in a long trip to found settlements at the other end of the Aegean? At Lefkandi, Xeropolis was certainly not abandoned after the end of the Late Bronze Age to the Late Geometric period; even the early excavations produced tenth and ninth centuries material there. The theory that after the collapse Greece turned to nomadic life has been challenged and does not explain how these nomads at Lefkandi turned into seafarers. At Mycenae, as in the rest of the Argolid, we have a strong local Protogeometric style with only a few influences from Athens. The survey in the area of Ascra cannot reveal much about the settlement contemporary with Hesiod. Finally, the Late Helladic IIIC period, covering the twelfth period, deserves a more full account from occasional references but such appreciation can only come from archaeology.

Thus, the book brings into light the period previously known as a Dark Age and proves that it is indeed a crucial period not only because it helps to understand the following Archaic period but in its own right. However, it is also clear that this period deserves a better understanding of its complex archaeology.

Oxford IRENE S. LEMOS
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni310

ERETRIA

K. G. WALKER: *Archaic Eretria. A Political and Social History from the Earliest Times to 490 BC*. Pp. xviii + 348, maps, ills. London and New York: Routledge, 2004. Cased, £65. ISBN: 0-415-28552-6.

This is the first monograph published on Eretria; it might be possible to justify an account of the city's history as a whole, but to end at 490 creates serious difficulties: much evidence from after 490 is adduced, but not discussed for its own sake. A stated—and achieved—objective is (p. xiii) 'to [make available in English] . . . material . . . that has appeared in other languages . . . over the last half century'. The author admits (p. xvi) to 'a propensity for wandering down minor research byways'; he rarely writes few words where many will do, and much of the book presents at length his views on non-Euboean matters. Had these tendencies been curbed, it would have been possible to progress beyond 490 and fulfil the original intention (p. xiii) to 'include chapters on dialect, demes, the arts and architecture, coinage and . . .

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni311 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cult'. They are sometimes required for argument on other matters; but there is no complete treatment of them.

The format is inconvenient. Notes are endnotes after their chapters; even simple references are given in them. There are technical flaws. The bibliography misleads by (apparently) giving dates of impressions, or reprints, which W. consulted: the first edition of the *CAH* ranges as late as 1977; How and Wells on Herodotus is dated 1975. The *index locorum*, which must be used alongside a separate Index of Authors, gives chapter and endnote number; it would be easier to use if page numbers, or at least chapter numbers at the top of pages, were given. It has too many inaccuracies. Discovery of one under Plato encouraged a test of all under that author; it revealed that fewer than half are correct, although most are only marginally wrong; but Hesiod (for example) is better served. There seem to be more, and greater, such errors in Chapter 7 than elsewhere; but brief random checks indicated that some cited passages do not figure, and that the General Index is not complete (add, to Kerkyra (Eretrian colony on), pp. 147–9).

An account of Euboean geography is illustrated by photographs; but they are too few to give a full idea of the range of the island, and the reproduction is poor. The rest is chronologically divided into eight chapters: two handle Lefkandi and Eretria and overlap. An epilogue outlines events from 490 to 404; the first of five appendices summarizes chronology as late as 87 B.C., and the remainder deal with details which cannot fit even into the often lengthy endnotes.

Much of the evidence, especially for early chapters, is archaeological; W. usually reports the discoveries of excavators, often by direct (and sometimes lengthy) quotation or translation. He also places, however, more reliance on Homer, and on much later evidence, than many would consider appropriate in the chapter on prehistory, mythology and cult. Discussion of the relationship between Lefkandi and Eretria, and even of the *heroön* at Toumba, whose 'occupants were Abantes, possibly among the last of the Abantic rulers' (p. 81), includes much speculation about interplay between 'landowning', 'commercial' and 'trading and artisan' elements in the population. That is only one of many speculative reconstructions, in which 'must have' and 'would have' frequently reveal the absence of evidence for the view taken not only of Eretrian (and Chalcidian) history but also of Corinthian and Athenian, which are often adduced as parallels: it is significant that A. French, *The Growth of the Athenian Economy* (London, 1964), is often cited. The tyranny of Diagoras, dated on grounds which depend on the use of the 'low chronology' (below) *c.* 538–509, is explained in similar terms.

Fortunately, the claim on the jacket and in the brief summary (i) that Eretria colonized in the Levant is not reflected in the text. The date of *c.* 785 for the Eretrian establishment at Kerkyra which preceded the Corinthian colony (p. 148) would, if correct, significantly alter our views of early Euboean colonization; but it relies on the doubtful argument that it was broadly contemporary with Pithecusae. The 'Lelantine War' is treated as lasting, in some sense, from the ninth to the end of the sixth century B.C. A chapter headed 'Eretria: Emergent "Great Power" of the Mid-sixth Century' argues that the city enjoyed 'hegemonic status, not only over Euboea . . . but . . . coastal areas of Boeotia and Attica as well as continued rule over its island empire . . . by means of its naval and commercial strength' (p. 183); but the evidence adduced is inadequate, and mainly relates to Peisistratus' exile in Eretria before his final seizure of the Athenian tyranny.

More Eretrian influence on Athens is detected when it is argued that both Cleisthenes' tribal system and the democracy he 'conferred' (p. 255) on Athens owed

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni311 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/bni311 Published online by Cambridge University Press