The book's range is sweeping: the making of Classical Greece occurred within a Mediterranean context that is duly acknowledged in interactions of peoples and influences. Beyond discussing obvious examples such as colonization, trade, and conflict, the author asks more subtle questions such as: "Did the centralised structures of Etruscan society stimulate social developments among Greeks?" (127). In addition to their intrinsic interest, these questions are a fine guide to readers through the complex story.

Osborne is frank about the nature of surviving evidence, as expected from a former student of Anthony Snodgrass; problems arising from the data are an underlying theme. Archaeological material, scarce for much of the time under review, flattens out history (17), while literary texts are the product of special interests, *not* what actually happened (xvii, 7). Moreover, the two categories of evidence "almost always pull against one another" (16; cf. 199). Recognizing this situation is not a counsel of despair, but it does demand concerted effort in separating what Osborne defines as the actual history of the past from its constructed history. Yet he is not a severe constructivist. One of the book's greatest virtues is the data it provides in abundant illustrations, maps, valuable tables, textual excerpts, and 22 pages of bibliographic notes offering further references to topics treated in the study.

Some readers will take exception to this view of the evidence, especially as it serves to diminish great events, such as the Persian Wars (328–43), and heroic figures, such as Solon (224–25). Events and figures yield to process, specifically the role of the elite in the development of both political society and cultural identity. Concrete "windows" on the changing world are opened through attention to particular places, where the author's earlier scholarship is used to fine advantage. But the account is not devoid of a human element; especially effective is the treatment of women's life in the Archaic period (226–32). Balancing divergent evidence, Osborne locates the social space inside and outside the family circle in which women functioned.

Given his view of the evidence, as well as the focus on the elite and the emergence of political communities, it is not surprising that the bulk of the account centers on the late Dark Age: only a 10th of the book's narrative pages deal with the early Dark Age, a disappointment to those who find continuous development throughout the Dark Age. Perhaps the imbalance stems from Osborne's ambiguity about the extent of continuity; while he states that "the debt in material culture [of Greeks from the 10th century] to the Mycenaean world is small" (3), he later writes "although change is manifest in very numerous areas of the material record, the element of continuity is very strong" (19). Discounting—as Osborne wisely does—the invasion/replacement theory of change, we must account for the culture of those who did survive into and through the early Dark Age.

To do so enriches even the story of the elite. While communities of this time were tiny, demanding cooperation among members to ensure the continued existence of all, the slightly larger structures at Nichoria and the 45-m building at Lefkandi indicate difference in status far earlier than the ninth and eighth centuries. Appreciating the difficulties for those who survived casts a different light on more specific aspects of the Dark Age too. If following the Mycenaean collapse "things [were] reduced to an individual level" (32), one can understand the need of superhuman aid in the struggle to simply stay alive. From this perspective, there are good reasons for taking, along with I. Malkin, the "more credulous line" about Delphi's role of providing counsel to petitioners (371).

A heightened sense of ongoing development throughout the Dark Age may also modify the view of the sources, especially the literary texts. In asking "what can tradition remember?" it is surely essential to consider the working of oral tradition from Mycenaean times well into the fifth century. While accounts must be preserved anew by each generation, and thus undergo change, the structured form of remembrance and the importance of their contents enhance their memorability. It was, after all, the remembrance of an age of heroes that rescued the Minoans and Mycenaeans from what was once regarded as the "fabulous age of Greece which must have no place in history" (S.E. Bassett, *The Poetry of Homer* [Berkeley 1938] 244).

A higher valuation of oral tradition surely explains the emphasis on accomplished speech as early as Homeric society. While the seeds of Classical deliberative oratory may be detected in the Homeric epics, it is unnecessary to envision an institutional background suited to the development of such skills in the eighth century (154). A member of the Dark Age elite must be one accomplished in word as well as deed.

It is to be expected that differences of opinion remain. After all, only in 1980 did Snodgrass apply then-untraditional methods and a new attitude to the sources on Archaic Greece to understand the period in its own right, rather than as simply a prelude to the Classical age. Though he claimed his study to be only "a preliminary step," so fruitful was the approach that the ongoing work of Snodgrass and his students is known as "the Snodgrass school." The present study shows its impressive momentum: Osborne has added yet another dimension to Archaic Greece in showing its roots.

CAROL G. THOMAS

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98195
CAROLT@U.WASHINGTON.EDU

NEW LIGHT ON A DARK AGE: EXPLORING THE CULTURE OF GEOMETRIC GREECE, edited by *Susan Langdon*. Pp. xii + 247, figs. 69. University of Missouri Press, Columbia and London 1997. $34.95. ISBN 0-8262-1099-6.

A day-long colloquium at the University of Missouri in Columbia in 1993, held in conjunction with the opening of the exhibition "From Pasture to Polis: Art in the Age of Homer," is published in this volume. It complements the exhibition's catalogue (also edited by Langdon), and several of the papers stand out for their richness and complexity, as well as their provocative positions.

The first paper by Ian Morris reviews the uses of Orientalizing forms of poetry and material culture throughout Greece in the seventh and sixth centuries. He articulates

a "middling" ideology that resisted the elite appropriation of luxurious foreign practices and objects, as well as cult. His lengthy survey of votive and burial patterns demonstrates notable regional variation and shows that the oft-remarked shift of attention from individual burials toward shared sanctuaries is not the case for all regions of Greece. (The summary of this "art of citizenship" is not eased by the lack of captions to identify his figs. 3–6.) Morris argues for the role of individual decisions in creating the record and for the identification of Orientalizing objects with heroizing values in Early Archaic societies. The leap of faith occurs in accepting that regions where Orientalia were deposited in sanctuaries, rather than in graves (fig. 3), were guided by the middling ideology (39). Not all dedicatory behavior in sanctuaries reflects communal values: sanctuaries provided a context for elite, individual competition more powerful than burial, where only those present at the funeral would have witnessed the deposition of objects lost to view after the event. In a complementary paper, Sarah Morris considers Greek and Near Eastern art, arguing as elsewhere that Greece was Orientalizing throughout its history. She claims, however, that the Orientalizing phenomenon is not bounded by either class or citizen status (65), and argues for the political autonomy of sanctuaries and the direct involvement of foreigners in creating depositional patterns.

Jane Carter provides a remarkably rich paper on Greek ancestor cult (a companion to her "Ancestor Cult and the Occasion of Homeric Performance," in J.B. Carter and S.P. Morris eds., *The Ages of Homer* [Austin 1995] 285–312). Carter argues that the Cretan and Spartan *andreia* or *syssitia* (male dining groups) were the occasions for singing great deeds, accompanied by lyre and pipes; Cretan bronze lyre player groups (of which two were in the exhibit) are connected with this custom. Carter compares the syssitia to the Ugaritic *marzeah*, whose hereditary membership celebrated heroic warrior ancestors. The marzeah continued into the Iron Age and was brought by the Phoenicians to the west; nevertheless, Carter concludes that the Greek rituals were not adopted from a Punic source, but that Greeks adopted eastern elements that fit their own, parallel institutions. Following Robert Koehl, Carter suggests that Temple A at Prinias on Crete was actually an *andreion*: the iconography of the building resembles that of marzeah paraphernalia. (Not mentioned by Carter, Lefkandi's "heroön" bridges the gap in time and space between Greek and Levantine practices; it was probably intended for a funeral celebration including food, drink, and song, and was located at a site with a great deal of early Orientalia.) Carter traces the connections of the marzeah to the iconography of Athenian Late Geometric pottery and the later Athenian *orgeones*. She concludes that ancestor cult was part of Ian Morris's "elite" system of values from the Bronze Age to the Archaic period throughout the Mediterranean. Unfortunately, she does not consider related recent work on tomb cult and early hero cult in this very interesting contribution.

In another very wide-ranging paper, Barry Powell assesses the origins of mythic representation in Greece, examining Egypt, Mesopotamia, and the "preclassical Aegean." Powell ultimately rejects the antiquity of the oral tradition itself, since if it existed it would have given rise to mythological representation in the Bronze or early Iron Ages. Amazingly, he even rejects the ninth-century Lefkandi centaur: as it has no narrative context, it is not mythological (174 n. 33). Powell concludes that knowledge of most Greek myths was restricted to an elite few, bards and their aristocratic audiences, whereas the majority of Greeks knew only folktales. He further argues that literacy was the key to the dissemination of mythological knowledge, making possible rhapsodic performances before wider, public audiences. Moreover, the representation of myth originated in the illustrations of specific poems (a position widely debated by archaeologists whose work is missing from Powell's references), or in foreign images narrating tales completely unknown before the Greeks encountered the images in the eighth century. Indeed, Powell wants to have it both ways: a new story, like the Lernean Hydra or Nemean Lion, which is figured in Early Geometric art, can be absorbed by Herakles because he is a Greek folk hero (184). If all this is true, we may wonder what the *polloi* ignorant of myth could have known or thought about the gods and their progeny in whose cults they participated.

The remaining papers present challenges to relatively new orthodoxies about the Iron Age. Barbara Bohen publishes material from the Kerameikos in Athens, suggesting that estimates of this community's Iron Age population and assessments of its prosperity in the Middle Geometric are both too low. Merle Langdon's paper on cult in Attica disputes François de Polignac's model of Athens as a cultic monopolar city, centered on the Acropolis. Christopher Simon summarizes activity at Ionian sanctuaries; these attracted foreign participation from an early period, but there is little evidence for foreign "influence" on the cults themselves.

Finally, the contributions of John Foley and Gregory Nagy focus on the epic textual tradition. Foley studies the unity of the Homeric *Hymns* and their basic affinities with Homeric epic. Nagy directs his attention to the conclusion of the *Iliad*, in which Achilles accepts compensation for Patroklos's death, and the dispute over blood-price figured on the Shield of Achilles. Building on his other work concerning the evolution of epic, Nagy concludes that the circle of elders judging the dispute on the Shield widens indefinitely into the audience of the *Iliad*, who eventually are the citizens of a polis.

The papers range greatly in length and level of accessibility. Langdon's introduction elucidates the connections between them, but disparities are obvious. Some consist of a few pages with little documentation, published nearly as read; others are lengthy and packed with current references. The generous number of illustrations in several of the papers is certainly welcome, but they are unevenly distributed among the contributions: Simon's paper is provided with no illustrations at all, while Powell's has no less than 26. The immediate appearance of this volume in paperback form makes it affordable, however, and it deserves to be widely consulted.

CARLA M. ANTONACCIO

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL STUDIES
WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT 06459
CANTONACCIO@WESLEYAN.EDU