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 To summarize, B. has in my view been overtaken—and superseded—by two major scholarly developments, one largely occurring within the field of classical studies, the other a broader phenomenon.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/53.1.239 Published online by Cambridge University Press

thoughtful, erudite, passionate, and very personal book centers on debates in the high Roman empire, early modern Europe, and Victorian England.

I begin by offering, in response to his challenge, a recent American legal contest over Hellenism: in 1993 expert witnesses on either side of *Evans v. Romer* claimed that a Colorado district court 'needed Greek' in order to determine whether to set aside a recent amendment to the state constitution forbidding officials from offering special protection to gays and lesbians. Oxford natural lawyer John Finnis, a witness for the defense (i.e. the state of Colorado, supporting the anti-gay amendment), offered a written statement of about fifty pages, including excerpts from books by Sir Kenneth Dover and David Cohen. Finnis asserted that these passages showed that classical Greek society and philosophy alike condemned homosexual acts. For the plaintiffs, Martha Nussbaum presented a similar volume of written testimony, arguing that classical Greeks did *not* condemn homosexual acts as such. Nussbaum's testimony included a discussion of how to translate Greek philosophical terms (*tolmêma* and *para phusin* in Plato's *Laws*). After the trial, the conflict between Finnis and Nussbaum (and their partisans) over Greek mores and terminology was carried on in private letters, academic journals, and public symposia (at Princeton and New York universities). Amidst charges of perjury, slander, and academic dishonesty, the debate featured discussion of the relative merits of the second versus the third editions of *LSJ* and classical versus post-classical Greek, who deserves to be called a Greek scholar, and (inevitably) 'who *knows* Greek?' Robert George, 'Shameless Acts Revisited: Some Questions for Martha Nussbaum', *Academic Questions* 8 (Winter 1995–6), 24–42, cites Nussbaum's trial testimony as follows: '[Finnis] has access to the ancient texts only through translations' (transcript p. 10) and he is 'repeatedly tripped up by things that are not in the Greek' (transcript p. 11). George claims (ibid.) that in a letter to George (October 29, 1993), Nussbaum 'asserted that her selection as assessor of the philosophical texts by the Loeb Library indicated that she is "the living scholar in the Anglo-American community whose knowledge of the Greek of the philosophical authors was judged to be the best". Having "steeped" herself in Plato and Aristotle, she further claimed to "have a sense of the Greek that is somewhat like a native speaker's sense after twenty-seven years, and probably as good a sense, where these authors are concerned, as any living person has" '. Not coincidentally, George, along with Finnis, was an expert witness for the state in the trial. See further, John Finnis, '"Shameless Acts" in Colorado: Abuse of Scholarship in Constitutional Cases', *Academic Questions* 7 (Fall 1994), 10–41; Martha Nussbaum, 'Platonic Love and Colorado Law: The Relevance of Ancient Greek Norms to Modern Sexual Controversies', *Virginia Law Review* 80 (1994), 1515–1651.

Although the Colorado judge decided the case for the plaintiffs on legal grounds that required no reference to Greek sexual manners or vocabulary, the academic/legal fracas brought 'Greekness' into the forefront of American debates about power, conduct, and identity. G. is right: 'who needs Greek?' is a question we moderns still need to ask.

Cambridge classicists are, it seems, increasingly interested in the Classical Tradition. It is no easy thing to move from studying ancient Greece to understanding its modern appropriations (as G. is acutely aware, p. 52), but G. proves an able cultural historian with a fine eye for unusual primary sources and reliable secondary bibliography. He avoids the standard tropes (recrimination, self-justification, millennial despair) of contemporary American classicists, who bemoan the putative demise of Greek studies, in favor of a heady pot-pourri of historical vignettes: Erasmus tirelessly exhorting his contemporaries to learn Greek, the rise and fall of Lucian and Plutarch as cultural

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.239 Published online by Cambridge University Press

icons, a 1910 performance of *Electra* that shocked audiences for its archaism and modernism alike, and the strange bedfellows in the Victorian debate over school reform, men who berated each other in public while amiably swapping Greek verses in private.

Although sporadically concerned with German figures (especially Hofmannsthal and Nietzsche), overall the book's orientation is British—and indeed Cambridgian (Erasmus, of course, was a Cambridge man). Considerable attention is paid to the 'greatest international intellectual super-star[s] of the modern west' (e.g. Lucian, Plutarch, Erasmus, Matthew Arnold, quote p. 14), and it is hard to avoid the sense of regret that no Greek scholar today (Martha Nussbaum possibly excepted) could lay claim to such a title. But G. makes the important point that Greek and Greekness have mattered a great deal to the self-definition of a great many people who fall outside that very exclusive club: poets, politicians, novelists, actors, dancers, playwrights, and musicians, as well as academics, distinguished and otherwise. Questions about Greek language and culture, in G.'s bold formulation, are always culturally relevant and never fixed. The Classical Tradition is 'a debate under constant and active reconstruction by *participation*' (p. 297, G.'s emphasis). As the subtitle promises, the focus throughout is on contests. This book is about resisting Greek language and culture as much as it is about embracing or saving them.

G. covers a remarkable chronological range: the excellent chapter on Erasmus, Lucian's editor, leads to an equally fine chapter on Lucian's own self-constructed Greekness. This, in turn, introduces a discussion of the politics of Lucian's nineteenth- and twentieth-century commentators, who ranged from the anti-Semitic Lucian-hater Houston Stewart Chamberlain, author of the vile and once-influential (especially in Nazi circles) *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, to the reclusive Lucian-lover H. W. Fowler, author of the delightful and still-influential *Dictionary of Modern English Usage*. A chapter on Plutarch begins with the literally central importance of the *Lives* (sandwiched between Goethe's *Sorrows of Young Werther* and *Paradise Lost*) in the three-book reading list of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* monster, moves back to Plutarch's Enlightenment readers (notably Rousseau), forward to the *Lives*' fortuitous salvation from shipwreck in Captain Marryat's 1841 children's novel, *Masterman Ready* (a Robinson Crusoe knockoff, prominent, we learn, in the young G.'s own reading list), back to Plutarch's own complex and troubled engagement with the problem of how to reinvent, promote, and thus save Greek culture under Roman rule, and fast forward to the 'cultural forgetting' of Plutarch (by serious academics) after 1850 and the relegation of the *Lives* to the realm of uplifting stories for children. Readers will inevitably find some sections more enlightening than others (obligatory passages on Nietzsche, Wagner, Freud, and Bachofen seemed a bit perfunctory), but G.'s skill as a narrator keeps us from getting lost or distracted as he leads us through this fascinating and complex intellectual landscape.

G. includes texts, images, music, and performance in his interpretive ambit. It is perhaps unfair to ask for even more interdisciplinarity. Archaeology is, however, a big part of the story of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century European engagement with Greekness (see Susan Marchand's outstanding *Down from Olympus* for the German side), and largely absent from G.'s account. Arthur Evans's extraordinarily well publicized Cretan excavations and his determined rejection of classical Greekness, for example, surely informed the currents of anti-classicism surrounding the 1910 production of *Electra*. G. is at his best when telling stories, reading texts and images, and letting his readers draw their own judgements; he is sometimes less convincing when he seeks explanations for changes in the standing of Greek authors. Why, for

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.239 Published online by Cambridge University Press

instance, did Plutarch's popularity collapse (among academics) after 1850? G. wittily dispenses with the idea that Karl Marx's disapprobation of Plutarch's historical skills (in an obscure appendix to his Jena dissertation) had anything to do with it. Yet to invoke the 'bloody history of modernity and of nationalism and its heroes' (p. 292) seems at once too broad and too narrow: too broad in that yes, modernity changes things; too narrow because it elides the reasons why postmodernists may also find Plutarch, who 'looks to Egypt to find Greece, to lay the foundations of his Greece, to assert once more the power of Greek *paideia* in the face of the multiplicity of the world', a dubious figure, at least in comparison to the attractive Lucian, who 'uses the interaction of religious differences to play so ironically with the categories of insider and outsider' (p. 281).

Irony and playfulness are much in evidence throughout the pages of this delightful book; G.'s heroes (notably Lucian and Erasmus) manifest them exuberantly; his villains (notably Luther and 'the grim Scaliger', p. 47) lack them. So it is all the more impressive that the author leaves us with a renewed sense of the genuine seriousness of contests over classical Greek language and culture in the long passage to modernity.

Princeton University JOSIAH OBER

WORKING TOGETHER?

S. J. HARRISON (ed.): *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics. Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature*. Pp. xiii + 330. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-19-924746-3.

As the editor of the volume, himself known both for his own traditional scholarly virtues and for his openness to the new, says, 'The "literary classics meets theory" book is already a genre in its own right'. Examples from the early nineties, such as the volumes edited by Hexter and Selden, and de Jong and Sullivan, could still present themselves as standard-bearers of the exciting and controversial advance of new theoretical approaches into texts traditionally the preserve of a mandarin scholarship. Nowadays there is no classics department in this country where some acquaintance with 'theory' would not be a recommendation for an applicant for a junior lectureship, if only as grudging recognition of the power of market forces in an age when students are also customers.

This particular, and arguably belated, example of the genre arises out of specific historical and institutional conjunctures, a footnote to the larger stories of scholarly politics narrated in the last two chapters of the volume: the observation by an open-minded participant at a conference of 'traditional' scholars on 'The Language of Latin Poetry' held at the British Academy, viewed by some as a bastion of established scholarly values, that the 'others' were not present. The resulting conference on 'Working Together', on which the present volume is based, was held in Oxford. The participants ranged from heroes of the revolution (John Henderson and Don Fowler, who until his death continued to draw energy in Oxford from a friction between the old and new schools of a kind that in Cambridge is now only memory), through leading scholar-critics who have internalized theoretical approaches as part of their working practice (Irene de Jong, Lillian Doherty, and Alessandro Barchiesi), to more traditional readers of texts but with distinctive and capacious agendas of their own (Michael Silk and John Moles). Notably absent, for the most part, are the textual

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.239 Published online by Cambridge University Press