

and more extensively in Sicily, but eventually also affected the steppes. Trade stations were established along the rivers but also along land routes, which must have played an equally important role.

We are largely left in the dark on the nature and quantities of the goods that circulated. We are hardly better informed about Sicily than about the steppes. Written sources shed some light on the question for both regions, but we are left with the archaeology to solve the question. Publication of data is regrettably only partial for both regions, and quantification as a result is absent or tentative at least. Bezrukov's important contribution here is his being specific about the amount and nature of objects found, an exercise not achievable for de Angelis given the extent of the data for Sicily. Future research should, however, aim at doing this, as it will provide important clues, even if only on relative proportions rather than absolute ones.

Independently from each other, both de Angelis and Bezrukov conclude that the basis of the regional economy in Sicily and the steppes was laid in the Archaic period. The Finley-esque approach adopted by both scholars achieves the highlighting of the importance of economic processes within political and social transformations. A huge factor in these economic processes was trade. Even if not monetised, trade activity was not marginal within local economies in which people were largely self-sufficient, but formed the core of the political economy and defined social relations.

The impact of connectivity on societies in the West and the East was therefore enormous and this observation questions the all-too-easy conclusions drawn by some Global Historians. It has been claimed that the earliest forms of globalisation in World History were not true globalisations, because the connectivity was limited to a single region (the Mediterranean) and was based on the limited circulation of a small number of objects that had no impact whatsoever on societies. Nor did the earliest globalisation create a 'global' mindset.

The conclusions drawn by both authors of the books discussed here clearly show that the degree of connectivity in the Ancient World has been underestimated and undervalued. The predecessors of the networks that came to be known as the Northern Branch of the Silk Road were firmly established in the late Archaic-Classical periods and interactions only intensified through time. East was connected to West and this had consequences that resonate in World History. Urbanisation rose throughout the Ancient World as a direct result of the mobility of people and objects. The mass consumption of goods led to

'global' attitudes, e.g. the consumption of wine was recognised from Spain to the Eurasian steppes and similar vessels were used for its consumption. The many religious syncretisms are another indication of globalisation. The Hyperboreans, probably a Greek version of a Skythian myth, informed the perception of cult activities on Delos. Globalisation in the Ancient World also meant that someone like Herodotus knew about the Urals and the tyrants in Syracuse and many other places, largely without even having been there. The world is a village, in the past as it is today.

LIEVE DONNELLAN  
VU UNIVERSITY AMSTERDAM  
l.d.donnellan@vu.nl

**Donald C. Haggis and Carla M. Antonaccio (eds). *Classical Archaeology in Context: Theory and Practice in Excavation in the Greek World*. pp. xiv+426, b/w illustrations. 2015. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter. ISBN 978-1-934078-46-4; e-ISBN (PDF) 978-1-934078-47-1; e-ISBN (ePub) 978-1-61451998-0; hardcover, paperback £123.99.**

This volume is a collective, multi-regional, multi-period, and multi-disciplinary reflexion on what is and what should be classical archaeology. The 13 contributions collected are organised in four chapters, respectively paying attention to 'historical contexts and intellectual traditions', 'mortuary', 'urban and rural', and 'sanctuary contexts'. The study cases presented come from Crete (Praisos, Azoria, and Arkalochori), Rhodes (Kymissaleis), Lycia (Çaltılar Höyük), Macedonia (Platania, Kompoloi, Douvari, Krania, and Vergina), the Peloponnese (Argos, Elis, Megalopolis and the island of Poros), Attica (Athens, Vourva, Marathon), and Sicily (Morgantina). The papers consider archaeological contexts dated from the Geometric to the Hellenistic period. A wide range of archaeological specializations, such as ceramology or bioarcheology (paleobotany, archeozoology, physical anthropology), and technologies (photogrammetry, interrelational database, tomography, geophysical survey, INAA, petrography, pXRF), is represented and discussed by the different contributors.

In their introduction, the editors, Haggis and Antonaccio, highlight the problem in defining Greek archaeology – a sub-discipline of classical archaeology – as a coherent discipline with 'a unified intellectual mission or even a reasonably discrete set of goals, methods, and generally

accepted principles'. What they find mostly missing in traditional areas of archaeological practice is close and critical focus on archaeological context. This requires one to free oneself from pre-established narratives, mainly historical, but also to take into account the various biases introduced by the archaeological record, especially in the case of old excavations. This is why their book differs from recent handbooks and companions on classical archaeology. This volume in fact does not intend to summarize and crystallise the dominant discourses on the Early Iron Age-Hellenistic period in the Greek world. On the contrary, it aims at considering archaeological data in their original context, taking into account artifacts (material culture), residues (formation processes), and sources (fieldwork), as defined by Lucas.<sup>1</sup> In this sense, a central role is given to research design, methods and results of fieldwork. This is why, despite its subtitle, 'Theory and Practice in Excavation in the Greek World', the 13 contributions 'deal more with practice than theory, methods than methodology, implications of new assemblages and contexts than interpretative frameworks'. They all, directly or indirectly, address the definition of classical archaeology and evaluate the potential of asking old questions of new data in Greek archaeology. 'This book is meant to explore how new forms of material culture and sites; methods of data recovery and analysis; scientific and analytical techniques and sampling strategies should be affecting the discourse in classical archaeology and the broad range of questions and strategies at our disposal' as explicitly stated at the outset.

Rather than following the order of the chapters, or the order used by the editors to present the contributions in detail in the introduction, this review considers the various papers with regard to the peculiar epistemological 'context' they deal with, namely old excavations, dominant narratives, traditional mental representations, or big historical questions.

Three papers address the specific topic of old excavations. Antonaccio evaluates the potential of older data to answer new questions, using the Morgantina Project and 'excavating an excavation'. Despite difficulties in recovering and comprehensively reassessing a large quantity of old data, it has been possible to document examples of Classical and Hellenistic Greek technical innovations, e.g. the use of terracotta tubes in the construction of domed and barrel-vaulted spaces, tessellated mosaics, and the Roman macellum. Thanks to modern analyses (instrumental neutron activation

analysis, pXRF, petrography) on the pottery, it is now clear that Archaic Morgantina was a centre of exchange and production and that its material culture was mixed, or hybrid (indigenous and Greek), opening a new discourse on identity and ethnicity. In his reconstruction of the history of research at ancient Praisos, Crete, and his evaluation of the way it affects our understanding of the ancient city and Praisian identity, Whitley pays special attention to the scholarly and intellectual traditions of the successive (British, Italian, Greek, French and Polish) investigators of the region. This allows him to point out one distinctive characteristic of classical archaeology, which he considers as 'a nexus for a number of distinct traditions of inquiry', compared with other sciences: classical archaeologists, he argues, still read with profit the work of scholars of the 19th century, whereas 'a few if any chemists would now read Lavoisier except out for historical curiosity'. Using the example of the increasing textualisation of inscriptions, which leads to their decontextualisation, Whitley notes that 'developments of archaeological methods have not been straightforwardly linear or cumulative', occasionally they have proven to be reactionary. Regarding the specific case of Cretan archaeology, he deplores the persistent gap between Aegean prehistory and classical archaeology and pleads for a fully diachronic approach to the longue durée of settlement and landscape history.

Small reconsiders a 'master narrative', according to which restraint in burial ostentation, as decreed by sumptuary rules, is correlated with an egalitarian ideology and the presence of a sense of citizenship, a concept proposed by Ian Morris.<sup>2</sup> Alternatively, Small argues that the social, political, and ideological interpretation of these restrictions in burial ostentation should be considered in the context of a cemetery landscape, a 'tomb-scape'. He challenges Morris' narrative by using cross-cultural analogies and then through turning to ancient Greek cemeteries, and in particular the Kerameikos at Athens, when grave markers ceased but earlier burials were curated and venerated. Small finally suggests that ancestral veneration was allowing ancient families to keep signalling their prominent status, despite restrictions in burial ostentation, and that this action was at the same time excluding families newly burying in the cemetery to use the place for status display. The argument is convincing, but perhaps one should remain a bit sceptical about the value of cross-cultural analogies, precisely because it may be unnecessarily risky and hazardous to compare 'contexts' which have little in common from a geographical, historical and cultural point of

<sup>1</sup> Lucas 2012: 10

<sup>2</sup> Morris 1989.

view.<sup>3</sup> Alexandridou's study of offering trenches in Early Archaic Attic cemeteries follows Small's thread, both in terms of perspective and interpretations. Her point is to show that until recently the pottery recovered from these trenches dominated the direction of research, disregarding the phenomenon of offering trenches itself and its social implications. She sees the trenches and trench ceremonies as an important expression of elite practices, allowing dominant Attic families to advertise and stabilise their social status and role. Both papers clearly demonstrate the importance of contextualisation at the scale of a site or a landscape in our attempts of interpretation of material culture. And both of them explicitly or implicitly challenge Morris' vision of an egalitarian ideology in Archaic Attica. One can note that at a domestic level, the Archaic pithoi recovered from the Hellenistic houses of Arkalochori, Crete, may constitute a later example of identity and status claim, as shown by Galanaki, Papadaki, and Christakis. Although the find context of these pithoi may first be explained in practical terms in view of their durability and utilitarian value, their symbolic value as family heirlooms and prestige items, as indicators of the wealth and status of their users, also deserves mention. A geographical narrative is also reevaluated by Hodos' contribution, which shows how the Çaltılar Archaeological Project allows a reconsideration of Lycia within a Mediterranean context, as a field of classical archaeology.

Another recurrent bias in classical archaeology, which is addressed by several contributions in this volume, is our traditional mental representation of specific classical spaces or buildings derived from ancient literature or early excavations. For instance Donati clearly and convincingly exposes how the large-scale excavations of the Athenian agora shaped our vision of the Greek agora. His investigation of three under-exploited Peloponnesian examples (Elis, Argos, and Megalopolis) offers new perspectives on urban integration, structure and use of the Greek agora. A gradual process of development is illustrated by the case of Argos, but it remains impossible to tell from when in its history of occupation the space considered can be called an actual agora. In contrast, at Elis and even more at Megalopolis, the agora constitutes a new urban experiment of the 5th and 4th centuries BC, with the construction of monumental stoas in canonical orders. Perhaps mention should be made of recent developments on Crete regarding the Greek agora, since current fieldwork carried out on the well-known agora of Dreros by the French School at Athens and the Ephorate of Lasithi may entirely change our

perspective.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, until now intensive excavations at Azoria did not allow the identification of an agora, although the site is clearly a civic centre, elaborated at the end of the 7th century BC, as convincingly argued by Haggis in the present volume. The case of Azoria also harms the traditional mental image of another civic space, that of the *andreion*. What has been revealed at Azoria is an architectural complex of large dining, kitchen and storage rooms exceeding the capacity needed for a typical household. The excavator has labelled it a 'Communal Dining Building' and it does not correspond to the description of an *andreion* given by ancient literary sources, but it clearly serves similar functions of public food mobilization and consumption. Whereas this Communal Dining Building was seemingly designed for a number of groups of participants, the 'Monumental Civic Building' in the same site was clearly more suitable for more open or communal assemblies, taking the shape of a large hall without space segmentation and with direct access to a hearth shrine and adjoining a Service Building including kitchens, storerooms and an olive press installation. Lastly, residential architecture at Azoria is also perceived as 'civic', as houses are built into an armature of concentric spine walls as part of an overall plan discontinuing the Early Iron Age agglutinative settlement structure.

Finally various papers presented in Classical Archaeology in Context show how big questions of an historical nature can be addressed through a particularly archaeological perspective. For instance, Margaritis reconsiders the ancient economy on the basis of archaeobotanical results from Hellenistic Macedonian sites (Platania, Kompoloi, Douvari, Krania) with a residential or industrial nature. In a similar geographical and historical frame, Kyriakou and Tourtas examine the role and treatment of the past in periods of crisis by providing a contextual analysis of pit deposits at Vergina, more precisely in and around the sanctuary of Eukleia, and at the cemetery of Stenomakri Toumba. The ancient economy is also addressed by Mylona in the particular context of the sanctuary of Poseidon at Kalaureia on the island of Poros. A careful contextual analysis of the marine fauna and fishing tools recovered allows her to offer a diachronic evaluation of fishing and cult related activities (dining, offering and potential sacrifice). Lagia further demonstrates the ability of bioarchaeological remains – anthropological this time – to inform the diachronic discourse on ancient economy and society, using the case of Athens. More broadly, the overview of research goals and description of field methods presented by Stefanakis, Kalogeropoulos, Georgopoulos

<sup>3</sup> For a recent charge against ethnoarchaeology and its quest for universal models, see Gosselain 2016.

<sup>4</sup> See the most recent report: Zographaki and Farnoux 2014.

and Bourbou highlights how a multidisciplinary approach supported and articulated by innovative technologies, as exemplified by the Kymissala Archaeological Research Project on Rhodes, allows progress on traditional core questions.

All in all, *Classical Archaeology in Context* is the first (hand)book of its kind. This volume clearly demonstrates that, if we want to use archaeological data as a proper historical source, it is necessary to purge them from pre-existing interpretations and reconsider them in their original context, at site, landscape or regional scale. It also illustrates the wide range of nature of archaeological data and gives actual methods to record and interpret these. This book will surely inspire historians and archaeology practitioners and can help to develop a best practice guide in our field.

- Gosselain, O. 2016. To Hell with Ethnoarchaeology! *Archaeological Dialogues* 23.2: 215-258.
- Lucas, G. 2012. *Understanding the Archaeological Record*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, I. 1989. *Burial and Ancient Society: The Rise of the Greek City-State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zographaki, V. and A. Farnoux, with the collaboration of D. Lefèvre, H. Brun, N. Kyriakidis, F. Gaignerot-Driessen, L. Thély, R. Bardet and N. Thanos 2014 [2016]. Mission franco-hellénique de Dréros. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 138.2: 785-791.

FLORENCE GAIGNEROT-DRIESSEN  
HUMBOLDT RESEARCH FELLOW  
HEIDELBERG UNIVERSITY  
driessen.florence@gmail.com

## Hellenistic

**John Boardman. *The Greeks in Asia*. pp. 240, 208 illustrations, 50 in colour. 2015. London: Thames and Hudson. ISBN 978-0-50025-213-0 hardback £32.**

**Elisabeth Katzy. *Hellenisierung Nordmesopotamiens am Beispiel des Khabur-Gebietes (Vorderasiatische Forschungen der Max Freiherr von Oppenheim-Stiftung 3,IV)* pp. x, 189, 97 Tafeln. 2015. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. ISBN 978-3-44710-377-0 hardback €108.**

These two books are underpinned by the same essential theme, Greek influence in Asia, but they are very different. John Boardman is one of the leading historians of Greek art with a record of publication going back over fifty years, Elisabeth Katzy is at the other end of her academic career with this, her first book, a lightly-revised version of her Tübingen PhD thesis. Where Boardman covers the vast expanse from Turkey to China over the course of many centuries, Katzy's focus is much narrower, a particular region of North Mesopotamia during the last three centuries BC. Both, however, make valuable contributions to our understanding of cultural interaction in the East.

Boardman is well-positioned to write this book. He has written on the Greek diaspora and its influence before. It was the subject of one of his earliest books, *The Greeks Overseas: Their Early Colonies and Trade*, first published in 1964 (fourth edition, 1999). The present book looks solely east and for the most part deals with a later period, its subject matter foreshadowed in the fourth chapter of Boardman's *The Diffusion of Classical Art in Antiquity* (1994). As with all his books for Thames and Hudson it is a high quality production with over two hundred images, almost a quarter of them in colour, although lacking the convenience of a table of illustrations. There is little in the way of typos, but a new printing might want to correct the date of Ctesias' stay at the Persian court from 500 BC to 400 BC (p. 59). Boardman has written a learned book, displaying an enormous and enviable range, but it is also a rather frustrating one. At just over 200 pages it is very much a survey. This leads to a brevity which does not always help clarity. A single short paragraph on pp. 29-30, for instance, manages to cover relations between Persians and Medes, the character of the Persians, relative cruelty of Persians and Greeks, the