scholarship by the French school. She closes by asserting that '[p]oststructuralist theory can help us to understand not only how each of these versions participated in the discourses of its own time, but how it has been appropriated, re-read, and re-written by the people of later times' (p. 151).

In Chapter 6, 'Myth, Folklore, and Popular Culture', D. explicates the rift between classics and folklore studies, and recommends a closer connection and bridge between them. D. uses the work of Zipes and Warner as models for classicists to follow. Folklore studies acknowledge women's importance in collecting and telling folktales; if classics explored more fully oral poetry and comparative folklore studies, we might gain further insight into the 'folk' and gender dimensions of ancient mythology. Finally, D. examines narratological approaches, using the myth of Cupid and Psyche because it contains embedded folklore. She illustrates the value of this approach with Winkler's study, which showed how the narrative frame reinforces or undercuts the surface meaning of such embedded stories (p. 165). Modern media sources package folktales for mass consumption, subverting the Utopian impulses discernible in older versions. However, D. notes that people still create subversive versions of tales, as seen in television 'fanfiction'.

This is a useful introduction to the most influential approaches to myth interpretation, geared effectively to its target audience. No myth is fully explored—D. is concerned rather to point out ways in which these interdisciplinary approaches can generate new insights by providing new ways of looking at ancient material.

Creighton University CHRISTINA CLARK

BLACK ATHENA DEFENDS HERSELF

M. BERNAL: *Black Athena Writes Back. Martin Bernal Responds to his Critics*. Edited by David Chioni Moore. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. Pp. xvi + 640. Cased, £45.95 (Paper, £18.50). ISBN: 0-8223-2717-1.

Two words come prominently to mind on reading this volume for review. The first is *chutzpah*. The fig leaf of academic respectability is preserved, perhaps, by having the volume appear as 'edited' by a colleague, but the personification of Black Athena (BA) as the subject of an active verb (though 'bites' would be more apt) speaks for itself. Delusions of grandeur. It is rather remarkable that a reputable university press should have agreed to publish this mish-mash.

The second word is potboiler. B.'s pot, the main BA project, is a substantial one, that has grown notionally from the three volumes originally envisaged into a four-volume opus. So far, however, only the first two of those four have appeared, the second more than a decade ago; it was, moreover, manifestly less well conceived and rightly less well received than its predecessor. Yet now B. threatens, or promises, a forthcoming companion volume to the present *parergon*. Clearly, the project is getting out of hand.

BA Writes Back, which is dedicated pointedly to his original intellectual mentors, Cyrus Gordon and Michael Astour, consists of four main elements (and a vast amount of repetition): reprinted and properly documented scholarly articles; scholarly reviews of three major books on related topics (by Sarah Morris, Walter Burkert, and Martin West respectively); more or less measured rejoinders to eleven critics of *BA*; and *ad hominem* (or rather *feminam*) abuse of Mary Lefkowitz (author of *Not Out of Africa*,

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.238 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which B. dismissively and questionably labels a 'popular' book, and co-editor of *Black Athena Revisited*, which contains a good number of the critical essays to which B. here responds). It is not worth spending time on the latter: a typical abusive subheading reads 'Why Lefkowitz has made so many mistakes'.

Towards, say, Edith Hall and Martin West, he is much more respectful: 'Hall is absolutely right when she claims that my knowledge of the secondary literature on ethnicity is sketchy and my use of the concept unsophisticated' (p. 92). His failure to cite the prizewinning *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1997), by her homonym, Jonathan, silently proves the damning point, and the gravity of that oversight has now been compounded by Hall (J.)'s *Hellenicity* (Chicago, 2002). 'West is more open [sc. than Burkert] to both earlier and later influences [B. means, more open to the possibility of the effect on Greece of earlier and later influences from the East than those of 750–650 B.C.E.] . . . [but] does not openly consider the sociology of knowledge or the influence of anti-Semitism on earlier scholars' (p. 325). In other words, though respectful, B. remains also recalcitrant.

I have said my own piece elsewhere, though neither of my two discussions of *BA* (in *Pedagogy and Power*, ed. Y. L. Too and N. Livingstone [Cambridge, 1998]; and *Afrocentrismes*, ed. F.-X. Fauvelle-Aymar et al. [Paris, 2000]) happens to be cited in *BA Writes Back*. To summarize, B. has in my view been overtaken—and superseded—by two major scholarly developments, one largely occurring within the field of classical studies, the other a broader phenomenon. As a result of our vastly more sophisticated understandings of Greek ethnogenesis and of historiography both modern and ancient, B.'s fundamentalist cultural diffusionism (exactly how Greek culture was formed from foreign influences is a question never satisfactorily addressed or answered) and literalist reading of Herodotus (the bedrock of his 'Revised Ancient Model') have been rendered entirely *passé*. This in turn makes his parade of learning—entirely genuine learning, I should add—about Old Egyptian chronography, Mycenaean and later Greek linguistics and phonetics, and a host of other matters almost entirely otiose. Unfortunately, his persistent etymologization remains as persuasive as it ever was.

I now confidently expect a 'reply' in the announced companion volume. Indeed, I shall be almost disappointed if I do not receive one. But I hope too that that volume will be the end of such self-indulgences. If B. still thinks he can demonstrate the plausibility of his principal positive historical reconstructions in the two remaining volumes of *BA*, at any rate in conformity with his relaxed criterion of 'competitive plausibility', then by all means let him make the attempt. But enough of these *parerga*.

Clare College, Cambridge PAUL CARTLEDGE

WHO NEEDS GREEK?

S. GOLDHILL: *Who Needs Greek? Contests in the Cultural History of Hellenism*. Pp. viii + 326, pls. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Paper, £15.95 (Cased, £45). ISBN: 0-521-01176-0 (0-521-81228-3 hbk).

The title of this highly original inquiry is meant to be taken seriously. Goldhill challenges his readers to answer the question, 'who [still] needs Greek?' And he sets out to complicate any answer we might offer by broadening its historical context. His

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.238 Published online by Cambridge University Press